education regrettably reflect the basic human resistance to change on the part of those who are in control of the institution which needs to grow. The NEA which has become a great lobby group for Federal aid to teachers salaries has to a large degree been responsible for the inability of communities to increase teachers' salaries as much as we all would like to see. First, the State components that go to make up the NEA have a stronghold, a stranglehold in some States like Missouri, on the teaching profession at the primary and secondary school levels. College graduates cannot become teachers by passing examinations or meeting other reasonable standards; they can only become teachers if they go to State-run teachers colleges.

The graduates of some of our finest private schools find it difficult, if not impossible, to become primary or secondary teachers in Missouri's public schools. This downgrades quality and productivity in the teaching profession itself. The Teachers Union has been resisting for years the innovation of teachers aids. By utilizing persons with lesser skills for the routine type work connected with teaching, we could increase teacher productivity greatly and increase salaries within the present budgets for the competent teachers in the process. The innovation of educational TV, which many top educators have hailed as being as great a revolution in teaching as the innovation of movable type was in the beginning of the 14th century, has also been resisted. I have heard professors, as well as secondary and primary teachers, present their objections to educational TV this way: "Does anyone believe that TV and visual aid can replace the lecture and the book?" This is a false presentation. The printed book did not replace the lecture, but it certainly provided such an amazing supplement that it is difficult for us today to realize that the first academy had no books and was all lecture. So it is with educational TV. It will not replace books, or lectures, but it certainly will nobly supplement them. Through educational TV all our students all over the country can hear the best lectures of our brilliant teachers, not just a limited few, even after the teachers have died. Just imagine the increased productivity in the teaching profession from the development of this new and amazing teaching mechanism and skill. I dwell on increased productivity because through increased productivity we can increase not only our quality of education but also the salaries of our teachers without the need to increase the budget.

There is another area of basic reform and progress which would permit us to upgrade education, both to increase its quality, extend it quantitatively, and lessen its cost. Presently we use our school plants and overhead only 9 months out of 12 months each year. The reason for this obvious uneconomic situation has its origin in another more basic social need which existed in the past, though it no longer exists today. We needed our children in agriculture enterprise 3 summer months each year.

Today we are no longer an agricultural society and there is no longer any reason for operating our schools in such an inefficient manner. I hasten to state that I am not talking about extending the school year for teacher and pupil from 9 months to 12. Perhaps for good educational reasons we may wish to keep the 3 months leisure for the individual pupil and teacher. However, Dartmouth College has gone away from the traditional two 4½-month semesters to the three 3-month trimester in order to lay the groundwork for four 3-month quarters each year. So our primary and secondary schools can easily do the same. We might have to air-condition our school buildings in order to utilize the summer months, but we would have more than enough immediate savings, let alone future savings, from this kind of efficiency to take care of these costs. Right off the bat we would have an easing of need for new classrooms. We would also have additional funds with which to pay teachers and increase their salaries.

By delving in deeply into one of the areas where there are great pressures today for State and local governments to look to Washington for help, I have tried to point up my main thesis. Do they need help from Washington? Is the real help they need right at hand in analyzing and facing up to the problems that confront them? Have other communities faced the same problems and met them? I believe we must answer these questions first before there should be any looking to Washington for help.

On the other hand, there may be areas where the Federal Government should be doing a job. Let's look into this briefly. I believe the Federal Government has a big job to do in education which, by the way, it is doing to some degree. A failure of the Federal Government to do its job may indeed put the communities in a position not to ask for help; but rather, to raise cain because the Federal Government is not meeting its responsibilities. I think the Federal Government must be a gatherer of information and a disseminator of information about what is going on in education. In other words, if a local school board is thinking about an educational innovation and wonders whether it has been tried any place before and, if so, with what success or with what failure, the Federal Government should be able to supply the answer. I believe the Federal Government has a big job today, which it has hardly touched, of developing nomenclature for the skills that exist and are needed in our society and relating those skills to whatever training or educational processes there may be for creating and improving these skills.

This is a continuing process and it is more difficult the more rapidly our society is advancing technologically. New skills come in, old skills become obsolete and of no social value. It is in this area that we should grapple with what is referred to as distressed areas. These areas are almost invariably areas where frictional or technological unemployment has hit a basic industry of the area. The greatest area of frictional unemployment today is our rural areas where the amazing technological advancement in agriculture has occurred so rapidly that millions of people who used to be able to depend upon their agricultural skills for a livelihood find that these skills have become obsolete and unneeded. One man and 1 acre can provide the food and fiber that five men and 5 acres formerly could provide. This continuing social problem could be handled admirably by tying it to our excellent Federal-State unemployment insurance system. We must relate frictional unemployment to retraining, rehabilitation, and education and treat it as an essential economic cost of doing business.

Whenever I try to tackle this subject I feel frustrated. I have spent most of my time defining what I believe are the real issues and exposing those which I believe to be false issues. In this process I end up finding I have had little time to debate that which I would love to debate. At which level of government do we best handle these various social problems we have placed in the public sector of our economy? This kind of debate can only come about when we have eliminated the stagnation which today exists in public discussion. This stagnation arises when one school of thought alleges that only that school is interested in meeting the social problems of the day and those who are in disagreement with the proposed solutions are thereby uninterested in the problems or are so blind or calloused that they are unaware of the problems. I would also call for a cessation of the kind of discussion which emanates from the other extreme group which dubs any suggestion of the Federal Government doing this or that as "socialism." I must confess that my sympathies are much more with those who utter the cry "socialism," because this term at least has a dictionary definition which we can refer to for intelligent debate and accurate rebuttal. And, indeed, a further expansion of the Federal Government can rightly be called socialistic, however, not with the nasty overtone that the user of the word frequently seeks to impart.

May we start discussing the questions of the part the Federal Government is playing, should play, or might play in various areas of the public domain from the standpoint of efficiency in getting the job done with proper regard for retaining the necessary posture to meet the continuing aspects which most social problems present. May the day soon come when we can begin this type of adult discussion. Too long have we been in the never-never land of TV westerns, the good guys against the bad guys.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1961

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

Rev. William H. Moss, National Chaplain of the American Legion, and pastor of the First Methodist Church, Pulaski, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father, for the love of country born in the hearts of our statesmen and our veterans. We thank Thee that this is not a selfish love, but is the outgrowth of the ideals for which our country stands: justice, freedom, and democracy.

We know, O God, that in this historic Chamber, as well as on the battlefields, patriots have fought to preserve our liberties. We are aware that the Senators here today are waging a struggle for the minds and hearts of men against a relentless foe. Give them, dear Lord, the strength, the wisdom, and the sense of Thy presence, that they may never waver from the ultimate goal of freedom from want and fear for all peoples everywhere, without which there can be no lasting peace.

We ask this in Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–1, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MACK, of Illinois, Mr. DENTON, of Indiana, Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, and Mr. BRAY, of Indiana, as members of the Joint Committee To Commemorate the One Hundredth Anniversary of the First Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that Mr. BURLESON, of Texas, Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio, had been elected members of the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that Mr. BURLESON, of Texas, Mr. JONES, of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio, and Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, had been elected members of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4806) to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4806) to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Aubrey Gasque, of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, be allowed to sit in the Senate during the debate on the judgeships bill.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO FILE A REPORT BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT—INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may have until 12 o'clock midnight to file its report on the feed grains bill, S. 993.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, consent was given to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to file its report on S. 993, the feed grains bill, until midnight tonight. I should now like to ask unanimous consent that the same permission be granted for the filing of individual and supplemental views on the bill.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are some nominations on the Executive Calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider them.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Mark Sullivan, Jr., to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Daniel J. McCauley, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, John S. Bragdon, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, John P. Weitzel, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and John P. Weitzel, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, Charles W. Yost, of New York, Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, and Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Norway;

Thomas K. Finletter, of New York, to be the U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

James J. Reynolds, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor;

Charles Donahue, of Maine, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor;

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and

Frank W. McCulloch, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

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

William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission;

J. Allen Frear, of Delaware, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

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

Norman M. Clapp, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. Jackson Graham, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Aubrey J. Wagner, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Civil Service Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1965.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I take great pride that Mr. John Macy, Jr., a distinguished resident of Connecticut, has been nominated for the post of Civil Service Commissioner.

This is a highly important position, and I believe that over the years John Macy has demonstrated superb qualifications for it: outstanding personal ability, sound judgment, and a wealth of administrative experience.

I, of course, take some pride in the fact that the nominee was educated in Connecticut at Wesleyan University and that he later held the post of executive vice president there.

He has held important administrative posts with the Social Security Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of the Army, where he was Assistant Secretary. He has served more recently as Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission.

John Macy's record is a record of distinguished performance in a variety of responsible posts requiring great administrative ability. I know that he will

make an able Civil Service Commissioner and I am greatly pleased at the swift manner in which the Senate has handled his confirmation.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard S. Morse, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William F. Schaub, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to recommend to the Senate Mr. Ramsey Clark as an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. I have known him for more than 10 years. I had the privilege of being a member of the State bar of Texas and a member of the Texas State Board of Law Examiners 9 years ago when Mr. Clark was examined for admission to the Texas bar. I helped administer that examination. Ramsey Clark had a wonderful academic record before he came to the bar. I found him to be a brilliant student and a brilliant prospect for the bar. Mr. Clark comes from a family that has made a long and notable contribution to the legal, judicial, and governmental history of Texas. He numbers among his ancestors drafters and signers of the present constitution of Texas. His father is a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; his father has two brothers numbered among the most eminent lawyers of the Texas bar.

Ramsey Clark in 9 years has risen to a position of eminence and leadership in the Texas bar. I predict that in the position to which he has been now assigned, in charge of public lands, he will make an outstanding record in the Department of Justice, and in doing so, he will follow a record of three generations that have demonstrated legal ability and the eminence of his family in Texas.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, to be Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain nominations reported from the Foreign Relations Committee be laid before the Senate at this time. I have discussed this matter with the minority leader, and he is agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be stated.

REPRESENTATIVES TO 15TH SESSION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the following nominations to be representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

Philip M. Kutznick, of Illinois.

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

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

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas K. Finletter, of New York, to be the U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifton R. Wharton, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate confirmed a number of nominations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. All of them were outstanding individuals. They were selected for appointments as our representatives in the United Nations, and also Mr. Roger W. Tubby to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; Thomas K. Finletter, to be U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Clifton R. Wharton, our present Minister to Rumania, to be Ambassador to Norway; and William B. Macomber, Jr., to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

I rise at this time to express my personal gratification at the appointment of all of these individuals, but most especially at the appointment of William B. Macomber, Jr., who has served with distinction as Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs.

I know of no one in that position who has performed more creditably. I think this is an outstanding appointment. I know Mr. Macomber has the good wishes of all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, both Democratic and Republican; and I want to take this occasion to publicly express my respects to this outstanding young man, and my gratification for the many jobs he has performed with distinction, dignity, and on a nonpartisan basis.

It is my belief that we are indeed fortunate to have a man of Mr. Macomber's ability represent us in this most important post; and I know I speak for the entire Foreign Relations Committee, and, for that matter, the entire Senate, when I say we wish him well in that post.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am gratified to hear the highly complimentary remarks of our distinguished majority leader about my fellow townsman and longtime personal friend, William Macomber.

I agree completely with the sentiments expressed by the majority leader. Mr. Macomber has performed his duties in the State Department in a highly creditable fashion, and has won the respect of every Member of this body.

I know all of us wish him well in his new assignment. I congratulate the President on the selection and on his securing the services of such a fine young man as our Ambassador in Jordan, which is indeed an important and critical American outpost in the Middle East.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I associate myself with my brother from New York and the able majority leader in congratulating the President and the Government as a distinguished and dedicated young man, William Macomber, takes an important assignment in the Foreign Service of the Government of the United States.

I know very few people who are as dedicated to the public service of this country, and, more particularly, to the Foreign Service, as is the former Assist-

ant Secretary of State, Mr. Macomber. During those years in that position all of us came to know him very well, indeed.

Highly able, highly intelligent, well experienced, with an understanding of the legislative process and the processes of the executive branch, fully skilled and schooled in matters of statecraft, he will bring to a highly important area of this globe a unique and marked ability, and with it he will take the best wishes of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say, after serving a good many years in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and after having had personal contact with a good many Assistant Secretaries of State for Congressional Relations, all of them good men, that to the best of my knowledge the only letter of commendation which has been sent by that committee and signed by all members of that committee on both sides of the aisle was the letter sent to Mr. Macomber, because of the outstanding and sterling work he performed in the capacity which was his in the Department of State.

Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the action taken by the Senate.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I report from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare four nominations.

After consultation with the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first nomination.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank W. McCulloch, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 27, 1965.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Donahue, of Maine, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James J. Reynolds, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain Senators, including myself, who wish to speak on these nominations, be allowed, later today, to include their remarks at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

CENTENNIAL OF THE DAKOTA TERRITORY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has a resolution which he wishes to present at this time. It has the approval of the leadership.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague of the Dakotas, Senator MUNDT, Senator YOUNG, and Senator BURDICK, I submit a resolution in connection with the Dakota Territory Centennial celebration. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read and be immediately considered.

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

The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 101), as follows:

Whereas the year 1961 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the creation by signature of President James Buchanan to the Organic Act, chapter 86 of the 36th Congress on March 2, 1861, of the Dakota Territory; and

Whereas from this vast empire, greater than the combined areas of France, Germany, and Italy, there have been created and added to the Union two whole States and parts of three other States; and

Whereas such States have contributed greatly to the strength and enrichment of our Nation; and

Whereas the area comprising the Dakota Territory was the scene of an epic westward movement which brought and continues to bring to fruition the American ideal of opportunity for all; and

Whereas the history of Dakota Territory is inextricably woven into the historical fabric of America—into its dreams and deeds, into its legend and history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States officially recognizes March 2, 1961, the centennial of the creation of the Dakota Territory, as being of significance in the history of our Nation, and calls upon the people of the United States to give proper recognition to the Dakota centennial observation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak at length. I merely call attention to the fact that today is the 100th anniversary of the signing by President James Buchanan of the Organic Act creating the Dakota Territory.

The people of my State have created a centennial commission. They are raising their own funds for the observance of the centennial. We trust that the Nation will take cognizance of this fact, and will join us in the observance of the centennial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that the resolution does not embody a request for Federal funds, but is merely a recognition of the day on which the establishment of the Dakota Territory was declared by President Buchanan.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that a few days after President Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated, he designated Dr. William Jayne, of Springfield, Ill., to be the first Governor of the Dakota Territory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my able colleague from South Dakota in the sponsorship of the resolution commemorating and taking cognizance of the centennial anniversary of the creation of the Dakota Territory.

Although we from the Great Plains area must take a back seat to our colleagues from the eastern seaboard when it comes to claiming descendancy from the valiant and courageous voyagers aboard the *Mayflower*, we can, nevertheless, point to much dramatic American history involving the exploration and settlement of the Dakota Territory.

In fact, Will Rogers, himself part Cherokee Indian, said at one time:

Although our ancestors did not come over on the *Mayflower*, many of the Indian people associated with the tribes in the Dakotas were here to greet the people on the *Mayflower* when they arrived.

Mr. President, many, no doubt, look upon us as youngsters in the American Union. However, history records that the Dakotas were traversed by the Verendrye Expedition, composed of a group of French explorers, in 1738. Shortly after the formation of the Union, a trading post was established in 1794, by Jean Baptiste Truteau, in the area which is now Charles Mix County, S. Dak. The Dakota Territory was part of the broad expanse traveled and explored by the famous Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1804 and 1805, following the Louisiana Purchase of 1803.

Major settlement of the area known as the Dakota Territory occurred after its formal creation by Congress on April 2, 1861. Since that date, the Dakota Territory has been the scene of some of the most colorful and dramatic history of

the West. It was in the Dakota Territory, at Deadwood, that the legendary Wild Bill Hickock was shot, over a gambling dispute. It was also from an Army garrison in South Dakota that Gen. George Armstrong Custer led his cavalry forces to engage the Sioux warriors in the now famous last stand on the Little Big Horn.

Because of this colorful history and such magnificent sights as the Black Hills and Mount Rushmore, South Dakota is rapidly becoming one of the major tourist attractions in the United States. I know that Senator CASE and all other South Dakotans join me in extending to all Americans an invitation to visit South Dakota in 1961 and join with us in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Dakota Territory.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Territory of Dakota, carved out of the Louisiana Purchase, celebrates on this day its 100th anniversary as an organized entity belonging to the United States. From Yankton in the present State of South Dakota came the petition for status as a territory. The petition was granted, the Territory organized by an act of Congress and on March 2, 1861, President Buchanan, just 2 days before going out of office, signed into being the Territory of Dakota. Later, out of this Territory came the States of North and South Dakota, the State of Montana, and the eastern slope of Idaho.

The first census showed a white population of 2,402. To this pioneer population now came newspapers, politics, the Army, law, and order. Yankton became the capital, a Territorial legislature was formed, and Delegates sent to the U.S. Congress. Drought, hostile Indians, and other misfortunes caused the Territory to experience slow growth. In March 1863, the Territory of Idaho was formed, thus removing a section of Dakota Territory. In May 1864, Montana was organized as a separate Territory, leaving the Dakotas at their present size.

By 1872, agitation arose for the furtheir division of the Territory and for statehood which was finally achieved in 1889.

Writing in 1866 of the Dakota Territory, Moses K. Armstrong, a pioneer Congressman from Minnesota, said:

> Let the early pioneer of the Northwest gather courage from the lessons of the past. Let him remember that out of a wilderness of 30 years ago have grown rich and powerful States, with their millions of people, whose steamers and railroad trains are thundering through every valley, and whose cities and church spires are rising from almost every hilltop and plain. Who shall say, then, that 30 years of the future will not build a highway of cities up our navigable and fertile valleys, over the golden mountains to the ocean. Then will the thoroughfares of travel and trade penetrate the interior of the Northwest wild and develop its unbounded resources. Let us remain true, patient, honest, and industrious and the world will admire us and fill our lands with people. The graves of our early dead will be honored in coming years, and the Northwest will boast of its wealth, trade, society, institutions, and men.

Congressman Armstrong's prediction was amply justified. Both North Dakota and its sister State to the south are today far along in the development and farsighted use of their natural resources.

Educational institutions are progressing at every level. Our farmlands are as productive as any in the Nation—no finer wheat, feed grains, or flax are grown anywhere in the country. Oil has been discovered in our State, adding greatly to its wealth. Energetic attempts are being made to bring more industry into North Dakota. We are busy pointing out the advantages which industry will find there.

So, on this the 100th anniversary of Dakota Territory's integration into fellowship with the rest of the Nation, we pause to express gratitude for the blessings that union has brought us and a hope for the continued progress and fulfillment of our common destiny.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the resolution already submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and cosponsored by me and the other Senators from both North and South Dakota has noted that today marks the 100th anniversary of the signing of the organic law for the Territory of Dakota. This historic occasion marked the commencement of a century of progress for both our States.

The rich and varied history of Dakota actually began long before the establishment of the Dakota Territory. Originally a part of the Louisiana Purchase, the French explorer, LaSalle, claimed all of the land drained by the Missouri River for France in 1682. Subsequently, the first white man to enter North Dakota, Pierre Verendrye, visited Mandan Indians on the Missouri River in 1738. Part of this land was later claimed by both Spain and England. The Louisiana Purchase in 1803 brought most of the territory within the United States. From that day onward, the area thrived as a part of our still young Republic. Nurtured by hardy pioneers and aglow with the exploits of the early fur traders, the creation of the Territory of Dakota gave official recognition to the growth and progress of this land.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that this historic anniversary be officially noted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BURDICK] for the initiative and ingenuity they have shown in having the resolution presented today, on the centennial of the founding of Dakota Territory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, because we shall be absent from the floor for awhile, I should like to make inquiry, first of all, with respect to the consideration of the bill that will be taken up today. On Tuesday last consent was granted to file a report on the bill, Senate 912, during the recess of the Senate; but, as I pointed out this morning, in a discussion with the majority leader, that report, 369 pages long, did not reach the Document Room until 9 o'clock this morning. Obviously, there was no opportunity for Members of the Senate to examine it.

Technically, consideration of the bill can be pressed under the rules of the Senate; but the point has been made, on a number of occasions, that, if the report is not actually available, there ought to be adequate time for that to be done.

I ask the majority leader this morning, when he sets this bill for consideration, whether it can be agreed that it can be considered today and also tomorrow; and then, of course, whatever motions should be filed can be filed today; but that would provide 2 days of consideration, rather than 1, and would offset to some extent the short deliberations this bill had on the part of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the request made by the minority leader is a reasonable one. I think it is agreeable to bring the bill up today, to have whatever debate Members of the Senate may care to engage in on it, to continue consideration of it tomorrow, and, I would hope, on tomorrow to consider all motions applicable thereto.

May I say for the information of the Senate, as long as the minority leader is on the floor, that it would be our hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has ordered reported the feed grains bill, could find it possible to begin debate on the bill on Tuesday next.

I will ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a comment on that proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say I would like to have the bill brought up as soon as possible, but, personally, and I believe I express the views of the majority of the committee, we would like to see House action on their bill before we proceed. It is understood that, if the House does not act soon, we can then consider taking up the bill sometime next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator. It is my understanding that the House Rules Committee today is considering the House companion bill. I think that the bill will be acted on next week. I appreciate what the Senator has said on that subject.

I should also like to give notice that we intend to take up the area redevelopment bill as soon as possible, hopefully next week. The subcommittee is meeting on the bill today, and it is intended that the full committee will act on it early next week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the last statement of the majority leader partly answers the question I had in mind. If perchance the House Rules Committee took no action making it possible for the House to act first, I wondered whether we could be definitely advised as to what the Senate business would be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the basis of what the chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee has said, it is his hope, if the House does not act soon enough, to bring the measure up for consideration next week.

It is the hope of the leadership that we will have before us next week the depressed areas bill.

Mr. President, I wish to express my gratification over the resounding majority given by the House yesterday to the first major antirecession measure offered by the administration—the bill extending temporary unemployment compensation benefits. I think it is a good indication that the Congress is indeed aware of the serious economic situation we face today, and the grievous effects of that situation on many American workers and their families.

I understand the Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings Tuesday on the bill, and Members of the Senate can be assured that the leadership will move consideration of this bill as soon as possible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law on agreement concluded under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, during the month of January 1961, with the Government of Turkey, and the Government of the United Arab Republic (Egypt) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS AND FUNDS UNDER ITS CONTROL

A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., relating to a report transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States, on an examination of the International Cooperation Administration report of appropriations and funds under its control, as of June 30, 1959, and transmitting, for the information of the Senate a copy of his reply to the Comptroller General of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Highway Trust Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

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

REPORT BY ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS ENTITLED "COORDINATION OF STATE AND FEDERAL INHERITANCE, ESTATE, AND GIFT TAXES"

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by that Commission entitled "Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate, and Gift Taxes," dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of certain aliens, with the request that their cases be examined with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1094

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to carry into effect the plan of former Congressman Aime J. Forand by including medical care to the aged under the Social Security System

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island be and it is hereby urged to importune the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to carry into effect the plan of former Congressman Aime J. Forand by including medical care to the aged under the Social Security System; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), on the occasion of our first session following the national elections of 1960, That we do hereby extend to President John F. Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON our congratulations on their election and our best wishes for a successful administration and the continued leadership of our country among the nations of the world; and

"That we do hereby express to former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon our gratitude and appreciation for the wisdom, courage and leadership they have devoted to our country and to the free world; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, to the Vice President of the United States of America, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, and to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"HERMAN T. F. LUM,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HEEN,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON,
"Clerk of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL

"Joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits for veterans of World War I; and for other purposes

"Whereas many hundreds of thousands of our Nation's finest citizens served the cause of democracy during the period of World War I; and

"Whereas many hundreds of thousands of veterans of World War I are now past the age of 65 and many of such veterans are without adequate means of support; and

"Whereas the honorably discharged veterans of World War I served their country with distinction, for which this country shall be eternally indebted; and

"Whereas it is believed that the Government of the United States should reward the honorably discharged veterans of World War I for their unselfish devotion to the cause of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to provide a pension to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who served 90 days or more during such conflict, upon their reaching the age of 60 years or over the same as that granted heretofore for the Spanish-American veterans and the veterans of other prior wars of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives

of the Congress of the United States and to all Members of the Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"TOM BOLACK,
"President of the Senate.
"M. E. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"JACK CAMPBELL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide compensating payments for tax exemptions granted in Maryland to members of the diplomatic corps

"Whereas the city of Washington, District of Columbia, by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the United States, is the seat of the Government of the United States; and for this reason all foreign diplomatic representatives accredited to the United States of America and accepted and received as such by the President must reside and maintain diplomatic establishments near the seat of Government of the United States; and

"Whereas following the end of World War II, the number of independent sovereign powers throughout the world has increased enormously to the point where it may soon become difficult, if not impossible, to find suitable housing for all members of the diplomatic corps within the confines of the city of Washington, District of Columbia; and

"Whereas such expansion of the foreign diplomatic corps has already brought about an exodus of such diplomatic representatives into the State of Maryland, where they are, and always will be, quite welcome; and

"Whereas in cooperation with the Government of the United States, the State of Maryland has exempted such diplomatic representatives from the payment of the Maryland sales tax and the Maryland income tax; has permitted certain diplomatic individuals living within the State of Maryland to use District of Columbia diplomatic license plates on their automotive vehicles; as well as extending other courtesies at some loss of revenue, such as permitting certain diplomatic representatives to bring untaxed spiritous liquors into the State of Maryland; and

"Whereas certain diplomatic establishments have purchased real estate within the State of Maryland, specifically, in two instances in Montgomery County, Md., and when the county tax assessor sought to collect real estate taxes assessed against the property, it was found that there is in force and effect between the United States and the countries involved treaties which exempt the countries from the payment of real estate taxes on real property owned by the foreign government and used for governmental purposes; and

"Whereas in each of the cases involving the treaties, Montgomery County, bowing to the constitutional concept that a treaty is the supreme law of the land, has exempted the properties from real estate tax assessment; and

"Whereas if such acquisition of Maryland real estate by diplomatic missions of foreign nations having favorable treaty relations with the United States continues, it will ultimately place a heavy burden upon the adjoining real property owners within the State or political subdivision to make up the tax deficit; and

"Whereas while the State of Maryland and its political subdivisions will continue to cooperate with the Government of the United States, it is the sense of this legislature that the State of Maryland and its political subdivisions should not be asked nor be expected to continue to assume additional burdens which have been created by the Government of the United States in the exercise of its delegated powers to conduct foreign affairs when the burden rightfully belongs to the entire body politic of Maryland's 49 sister States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized of the sense of this joint resolution and the need for alleviation of the loss of revenue sustained by the State of Maryland and its political subdivisions due to tax exemptions granted representatives of foreign governments by reason of obligations imposed by treaties and agreements of the Government of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be requested to make provision by law for compensating payments to the State of Maryland and to any of its political subdivisions which grant tax exemptions to members and representatives of the diplomatic corps; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be directed to send copies of this joint resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas at the 2d session of the 86th Congress of the United States of America, it was resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), this action having been taken in Senate Joint Resolution 39, that the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" 'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, That the foregoing amendment to the Constitution of the United States is ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States authentic copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; ordered to lie on the table:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 15

"Joint resolution pledging the wholehearted support of the citizens of the State of Maryland to the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON on the occasion of their inauguration as the President and Vice President of the United States of America

"Whereas the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON have contributed their efforts to many years of public service and have distinguished themselves as men possessing outstanding leadership qualities; and

"Whereas the American people have elected them to the highest offices of this Nation, the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the citizens of the great State of Maryland, through their elected representatives in the General Assembly of Maryland desire to extend their warm and sincere congratulations to the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON on the occasion of their inauguration to the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States of America and desire to pledge to them their wholehearted support throughout their efforts to lead this great Nation and the world into an era of prosperity, brotherhood and peace: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON be and they are hereby congratulated by the citizens of Maryland upon their inauguration to the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States of America and the citizens of the State of Maryland pledge to them their wholehearted support throughout their efforts to lead this great Nation and the world into an era of prosperity, brotherhood and peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maryland be and he is hereby requested to transmit under the great seal of this State a copy of the aforegoing resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each of the representatives from Maryland in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Placentia, Calif., relating to the acquisition of Federal surplus property by municipal governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., relating to community health services, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the present excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on telephone and telegraph service

"Whereas an excise tax is levied on telephone and telegraph service by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency tax to help

pay war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

"Whereas there is no longer justification for imposing such tax for the purposes for which it was initially intended; and

"Whereas telephone and telegraph service is essential to the orderly transmission of information required in transaction of business and personal affairs; and

"Whereas the tax imposes an undue hardship upon millions of individuals and businesses in this country, and it is discriminating in that no other public utility services are still so taxed; and

"Whereas the maintenance of an adequate communication system is essential to the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax levied on telephone and telegraph service; and

"That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the South Dakota delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the house February 6, 1961.

"Concurred in by the senate February 13, 1961.

"CARL BURGESS,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"JOE BOTHAM,
"President of the Senate, Lieutenant Governor.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the enactment of a law ceding to the State of South Dakota certain lands in the State

"Whereas at the date of the original Government survey of the land situated in the State of South Dakota, there were bodies of water, in the form of lakes and streams, covering in many instances several sections of land; and

"Whereas these lakes and streams were of such proportions that they meandered at the time of the survey; and

"Whereas since the lands of South Dakota have been subjected to cultivation, these lakes and streams have become dry by evaporation and other causes; and

"Whereas good wildlife management and water conservation practices could be effected to a greater degree after the elimination of the current confusion of ownership and status of these lands; and

"Whereas the lands formerly comprising these lakes and streambeds have become valuable for agricultural, wildlife management, and water conservation use, and there is no means by which title to these lands may be procured, and these lands are not considered Federal waterways and are not within any Indian, military or other reservation; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has transferred to States title to certain public lands after acceptance by the States of original endowments and grants: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact a law authorizing and ceding to the State of South Dakota these lands and carrying the provisions into effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house January 20, 1961.

"Concurred in by the senate February 14, 1961.

"CARL BURGESS,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"JOE BOTHAM,
"President of the Senate, Lieutenant Governor.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

PRESIDENTIAL CONGRATULATIONS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I can advise that the Legislature of Washington State has voiced its congratulations to President John F. Kennedy.

Also, members of both the House of Representatives and Washington State Senate have extended to the Kennedy administration felicitations and sincere best wishes, expressing confidence that the new administration will meet with wisdom and foresight the numerous and momentous matters which are now, and will in the ensuing years, be placed before it for consideration.

I submit for the RECORD the copy of House Joint Memorial 5 forwarded to me by S. R. Holcomb, chief clerk, House of Representatives, Legislature of the State of Washington:

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there was held on November 8, 1960, a national election for the purpose of electing officers to various National and State offices; and

Whereas as the outcome of said national election, a new administration in the National Government of the United States is assuming office under the leadership of the Honorable John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Washington does hereby congratulate the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, and extend to the new national administration, under his leadership, felicitations and sincere best wishes from this legislature. We are confident that the new administration will meet with wisdom and foresight the numerous and momentous matters which are now, and will in the ensuing years, be placed before it for consideration; and be it hereby further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and of the House, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation.

Passed the house January 19, 1961.
JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
Speaker of the House.
Passed the senate January 20, 1961.
JOHN A. CHERBERG,
President of the Senate.

COMMENDATION FOR CONGRESSWOMAN JULIA BUTLER HANSEN—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is with particular pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to spread upon the RECORD a certified copy of House Joint Resolution 35 approved by the Washington State Legislature.

This resolution recognizes the fine job done by a Member of this Congress, Representative JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, of my own State of Washington.

Those who approved this resolution in the State capitol of Olympia know Congresswoman HANSEN well, for most of them served with her for many, many terms.

Her leadership in the fields of education, highways, public assistance, and State government is referred to. And well it can be, for she did her job well at the State level as is now the case in the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent now that House Joint Resolution 35 be entered in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington (in legislative session assembly):

Whereas Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, of Wahkiakum County, has been recently elected from the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington to the U.S. House of Representatives, being the first woman Democrat from the State of Washington to be so elected to U.S. Congress; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN ably and conscientiously served the citizens of this State, and more particularly the citizens of the 18th legislative district, for 22 years in the Legislature of the State of Washington; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN earned an outstanding reputation in the house of representatives in many fields, particularly those of education, institutions, public assistance, State government, and highways; and

Whereas under the leadership of JULIA BUTLER HANSEN as chairman of the house highways committee and chairman of the western interstate committee on highway policy program of the 13 Western States, the State of Washington has achieved national recognition in the field of highway research and progressive highway legislation; and

Whereas Mrs. HANSEN has always demonstrated unusual astuteness in legislative matters, showing extreme fairness and responsibility which were reflected in the measures which came on the floor in her name or the name of her committee, the results of which were seldom questioned in either House; and

Whereas JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, while maintaining a successful career as a businesswoman and a mother and housewife,

still gave unstintingly of her time to devote herself to the interests of the citizens of this State and the progressive betterment of the State of Washington: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the house of representatives and senate do hereby express to JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, not only as individual members but as spokesmen for the constituents whom we represent, our deep appreciation for her outstanding leadership and contribution to the State of Washington and our warmest wishes for all success in her new position in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, to Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the other Members of Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the house February 21, 1961.

JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 22, 1961.

JOHN A. CHERBERG,
President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF HIGHWAY COMMITTEE, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INDEPENDENCE, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the highway committee of the Independence, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, has made a thorough study of an adequate system of roads and highways for the United States and in my opinion has made some very fine suggestions.

In view of the great importance to Kansas and the Nation of a future program of expanded highway construction, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by that organization be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Public Works Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and highways in the United States is of special concern to the Chamber of Commerce of Independence, Kans.; and

Whereas the chamber has caused its highway committee to study from time to time the present conditions of roads and highways serving the Nation and to consider the long range interests of the United States in improving and maintaining adequate roads and highways for its citizens; and

Whereas the highway committee of this chamber has recommended the adoption of certain principles which should be considered from time to time by Congress and by those agencies of the Federal Government engaged in maintaining existing roads and highways and in providing for an adequate future network of roads and highways; and

Whereas it is believed that if our Congress and other Federal agencies having authority in the matter will give consideration to the principles hereinafter enumerated, the best interests of the Nation with regard to its system of roads and highways will be served: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Independence, Kans., does hereby approve the recommendations of its highway committee and does hereby adopt as its own the following principles:

1. Federal highway program: An expanded construction program is necessary to remedy present deficiencies and improve the Nation's highways. The Federal Government should assume primary responsibility for financing the modernization of the Interstate Highway System. Additional funds needed to finance the Federal Government's share of the costs of an expanded program should be obtained to the maximum extent feasible from current highway user revenues.

2. Compensatory interstate mileage: The chamber supports legislation to equitably reimburse in money or in mileage each State for every portion of a toll or free highway, bridge, or tunnel within such State which is on the Interstate System, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957.

3. Federal highway user revenue: Congress should end the diversion of Federal highway user revenues into the general fund by earmarking all such revenue for the highway trust fund.

4. Additional revenues from increases in user taxes: The chamber is opposed to increases in excise and motor fuel taxes upon highway users and feels that additional levies of this nature should be made only as a last resort and in the event the course suggested under the preceding paragraph 3 hereof should fail to provide ample revenues for the highway trust fund; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, U.S. Senator, and the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator, from Kansas, and the Honorable WALTER L. MCVEY, U.S. Congressman, serving the district in which Independence is situated.

Dated this 27th day of February 1961.

LONNIE N. WOOD,
President.

RALPH E. COX,
Secretary.

KANOPOLIS IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 7—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President's proposed budget for construction and planning by the Bureau of Reclamation includes funds for advanced planning for Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7.

Hearings on this project will be held before the chief engineer, division of water resources, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, on March 20 and 21.

The steering committee for Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7, headed by Abner R. Lundquist, chairman, and E. Leonard Nelson, secretary, has furnished me with a copy of a resolution urging this planning. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of my remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a hearing on the petition for the organization of the Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7 will be held before the chief engineer, division of water resources, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, on March 20 and 21, 1961, and authority for said organization is anticipated at that time; and

Whereas the President's proposed budget for the next year has included the sum of $215,000 for advanced planning funds for said Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7; and

Whereas it is anticipated that actual construction of said irrigation project could be commenced during the coming year if funds were available: Therefore be it

Resolved by the steering committee of the Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7, That this committee endorse the budget proposal for planning funds for the Kanopolis Irrigation District No. 7 in the amount of $215,000; be it further

Resolved, That this committee take the necessary and appropriate action to urge Congress to also include in the proposed budget for next year funds for the commencement of construction of said irrigation project; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to our Kansas Senators and Congressmen and other persons interested in the advancement of irrigation projects.

Adopted this 23d day of January 1961.

ABNER R. LUNDQUIST,
Chairman.

Attest:

E. LEONARD NELSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ABILENE (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the board of directors of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce, resolutions were adopted expressing its views in the field of education, minimum wage law, and the interstate highway building program.

In view of the importance of these programs to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

RESOLUTION 1

Your committee endorses and recommends to the board of directors of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce that said chamber go on record as being in favor of H.B. 135, S.B. 51, H.B. 104 and S.B. 160. These bills are all presently pending in the Legislature of the State of Kansas and have to do with proposals in the field of education. H.B. 135 and S.B. 51 are identical in that they propose to increase the present emergency support from $15 per pupil to $25 per pupil. H.B. 104 has to do with the computation of State aid in that it provides for financial credit for one-half of kindergarten costs for the students and teachers. S.B. 160 concerns proposals to create a school transportation section within the State department of public instruction which would approve school bus routes and supervise school transportation. Your committee feel that action on the State and local level with regard to our schools is much to be preferred over Federal legislation.

RESOLUTION 2

Your committee endorses and recommends that the board of directors go on record and make every effort to urge opposition to any increase in or extension of the coverage of the minimum wage law.

RESOLUTION 3

Your committee endorses and recommends that the board of directors of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce place themselves on record as being very much in favor of the interstate highway building program. It is further urged that any and all funds previously collected for the express purpose of furthering this program be applied solely for that purpose without diminution so as

to make unnecessary further increases in the burden of taxes already assessed against the highway using public.

RESOLUTIONS OF TRIBAL COUNCIL OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three resolutions adopted by the Tribal Council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians be inserted at this point in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committees.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 2–61

"Whereas the Red Lake Tribal Council requested of the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs an oral report relating to the present utilization of the band's forestry resources and plans for increased future utilization; and

"Whereas the representatives of said Forestry Division appeared before the council and explained the problems involved in attempting to adequately administer and supervise the utilization of said forest resources of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians; and

"Whereas it appears to this council that the problems involved in maximum utilization of our forest resources are primarily due to insufficient personnel in the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

"Whereas this council has demanded of the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs a better utilization of our forest resources; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this council that the forest resources of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians could be better utilized to produce added income to the Red Lake Band in the immediate future and to insure increased income to the band in later years; and

"Whereas the economy of the Red Lake Indian Reservation is in dire and great need of improvement; and

"Whereas the benefits resulting from use of increased personnel in the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs would redound to the benefit of the entire northern portion of the State of Minnesota, in addition to the improving of the economy on the Red Lake Indian Reservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this tribal council indicate its concurrence in the need for an increase of personnel in the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and be it further

"Resolved, That this tribal council convey to its representatives in the U.S. Congress its thoughts and sentiments in the matter with a petition for an increase in the budget of gratuity funds for the Forestry Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs so as to permit an increase in the personnel available for services in administering and supervising the use of the forestry resources of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION 6–61

"Whereas, Resolution 30–59, duly adopted at the regular meeting of the Red Lake Tribal Council held on March 10 and 12, 1959, undertook to set forth the sentiment of this council relative to the hospital building and related buildings comprising the facilities in which the Division of Indian Health undertakes to serve the health needs of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians residing on the Red Lake Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas the needs of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians have not been met with construction of an adequate hospital building, clinic buildings or personnel housing remain grossly inadequate and obsolete; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this council that no plan for renovation, remodeling or repair of existing facilities will serve to meet the minimal requirements of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this council respectfully petition and urge its U.S. congressional delegation to initiate all measures necessary to replace presently inadequate and obsolete facilities with a new 35-bed hospital, necessary medical-surgical facilities and housing facilities for medical personnel; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to those officials of the State and Federal Government who, in the opinion of the tribal officers, shall be concerned with health problems of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians."

"RESOLUTION 30–59

"Whereas the Red Lake Tribal Council representing the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians residing on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Red Lake, Minn., assembled in legal council on February 10, 1959, appointed a committee on health, social welfare, law and order to make a survey and study the conditions of the three tribal activities which have a profound effect upon the Red Lake Band's general welfare and security and that the committee make a report of their findings to the tribal council; and

"Whereas the said committee having completed their survey and study reported their findings on the neglected deplorable Red Lake Indian Hospital situation with the following:

"1. Hospital building: 45 years old and obsolete, should be replaced with a new hospital, the present facilities are detrimental for the efficient administration of the Indian health program on the Red Lake Indian Reservation.

"2. Fire hazard: Hospital building is a firetrap endangering the safety and lives of the medical personnel and patients.

"3. Sanitation: Hospital unsanitary conditions, difficult to maintain sanitary standards conducive to encouraging higher health standards expected by the Division of Indian Health. Require more sterilizing equipment.

"4. Clinic buildings at Red Lake and Ponemah are unfavorable.

"Red Lake clinic building: This building is inadequate and much too small, impractical to try repair or renovate to enlarge clinic services, difficult to heat, it is a separate unit situated away from the main hospital, patients very ill are required to walk at least one block distance to obtain essential X-ray services and laboratory tests in the main hospital, need more doctors and nurses to expedite clinic services, clinic services should be consolidated under one main hospital building.

"5. Ponemah clinic building: This building should be replaced with a new clinic building with adequate living quarters to station a full-time field doctor or nurse in Ponemah. This district represents approximately 500 members of the band residing permanently in this area, also a school with an average of 90 pupils attending is maintained in Ponemah. It is 42 miles from the extreme west end of Ponemah to the main hospital in Red Lake; this distance factor creates hardships for the Ponemah people in seeking emergency medical aid, especially during the cold winter months. Ponemah urgently needs some form of ambulance service, or provide more clinic services other than the 1-day-a-week service as scheduled now in Ponemah.

"6. Housing shortage for Division of Indian Health personnel: Need more decent housing and kitchenette apartments for housing, nurses, dentist, druggist, administrator, maintenance help, cooks, and one chauffeur necessary to be stationed near the hospital for emergency trips.

"7. Need more medical-surgical doctors and nurses to expand the Division of Indian Health administration in order to promote better and efficient medical services on the reservation; and

"Whereas the members of the tribal council are fully aware from their long and close observations of certain outside pressures by strong advocates to justify the eventual closing of the reservation hospital in order to promote the expansion of outside private hospitals at the expense of the Indian health needs; and

"Whereas this intolerable concerted effort of exploitation of the Indian health needs, is another step toward retrenchment on the promises made to the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians when negotiations were instituted for the transfer of the Bureau of Indian Affairs medical services to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Public Health Service; and

"Whereas it appears that the voice of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians is completely disregarded against these devious retrenchment efforts to justify the means of closing the reservation hospital and thereby leaving a token form of medical service on the unallotted Red Lake Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas the Red Lake Indian Reservation is the only unallotted Indian reservation remaining in the State of Minnesota and it is the sentiment of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians to retain their reservation as a home base of security and with the increasing population of the band, the request for the construction of a new hospital with all necessary medical-surgical facilities and housing facilities on the Red Lake Indian Reservation is imperative to fulfill the efficient administration of the Division of Indian Health properly for the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Red Lake Tribal Council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians assembled in legal council on March 10 and 12, 1959, Do hereby respectfully petition and urge the U.S. Senators: HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, and Congressman ODIN LANGEN to initiate all measures necessary to replace the obsolete Red Lake Indian Hospital with the construction of a new 35-bed hospital with all necessary medical-surgical facilities and housing facilities which is an operational requirement in the medical administration by the Division of Indian Health of the U.S. Public Health Service on the Red Lake Indian Reservation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to and seek support of: Gov. Orville L. Freeman; Hon. Harry Basford, chairman, State of Minnesota Legislative Interim Committee on Indian Affairs; Dr. Henery E. Allen, chairman, Indian Subcommittee of the Governor's Human Rights Commission; Dr. James R. Shaw, Assistant Surgeon General and Chief, Division of Indian Health; Mr. Forest J. Gerard, tribal relations officer, Division of Indian Health; Dr. Joseph H. Gerber, medical officer in charge, Division of Indian Health, Aberdeen area; Dr. Sidney Finkelstein, medical officer in charge, Division of Indian Health, Bemidji area; Dr. Paul C. Beleau, medical officer in charge, Division of Indian Health, Red Lake Indian Hospital; and Supt. W. W. Palmer, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Minnesota Agency."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 278. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 57); and

S. 336. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps (Rept. No. 56).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 307. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore in San Diego County, Calif. (Rept. No. 58).

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

S. 993. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961; with individual and minority views (Rept. No. 59).

PRINTING OF "LEGISLATION ON FOREIGN RELATIONS WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That "Legislation on Foreign Relations With Explanatory Notes" be printed as a Senate document, and that two thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1144. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1145. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 1146. A bill to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 2 years the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Isabel Perez-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of A. Hameed Haz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1149. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1150. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Denny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1151. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for road rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1152. A bill to permit the coverage under social security of certain policemen and policewomen in the city of Hammond, La.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1153. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1155. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 1156. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be treated as a separate quota area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1158. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1159. A bill to provide increased authorizations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963, for forest development roads and trails, Indian reservation roads, and public lands highways, and to provide authorization for the construction of national forest recreation and access roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1160. A bill for the relief of Richard Klava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1161. A bill to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BLAKLEY:

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income-tax exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a fulltime college student and an additional income-tax exemption of $400 for an individual who is a fulltime high-school student; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1163. A bill for the relief of Kenneth L. Hornum, Kenneth M. Rasmussen, Robert F. Reid, and Ronald L. Wick; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Shao Fong Sha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1165. A bill to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1166. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices for reasons of age, by Federal Government contractors and subcontractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Capt. Wilford W. Horne;

S. 1168. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr.;

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of the minor child of the late Julia Rodgers Baker;

S. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Horne and her children, Faye Horne, Frances Horne, Floyce Horne, Patricia Horne, and Brenda Sue Horne;

S. 1171. A bill for the relief of Nicholaus Petrantis; and

S. 1172. A bill for the relief of Lawrence S. Burks, William H. Ducan, Charles O. Fugitt, Freddie E. Fulghum, Billy Wade Mooney, Jimmie R. Robinson, and Hugh T. Weatherbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1173. A bill to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1174. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kwan Ho Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lopinto Arzaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1176. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition and disposition of proprietary rights in scientific and technical information obtained and inventions made through the expenditure of public funds; to establish in the executive branch of the Government a Federal Inventions Administration to administer in the public interest the proprietary rights of the United States with respect to such information and inventions; to encourage the contribution to the United States of inventions of significant value for national defense, public health, or any national scientific program; and for other purposes; and

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Herbert Kaempf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

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

S. 1178. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1179. A bill for the relief of Alicja Zakrezewska Gawkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Carlos Teodoro Trevino Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1181. A bill to promote mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management in order to increase productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, through the establishment of a National Productivity Council and the promotion of local and industrywide councils; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

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

S. 1182. A bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1961, to require more effective measures to be taken for the allocation of procurement contracts within areas of economic dislocation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses;

S. 1184. A bill to conform the provisions of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with those of section 510 thereof as amended by Public Law 86–575, approved July 5, 1960, and for other purposes; and

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

S. 1186. A bill to facilitate the protection of consumers of articles of merchandise composed in whole or in part of gold or silver from fraudulent misrepresentation concerning the quality thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Federal air pollution control law to provide for a more effective program of air pollution control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1188. A bill to establish Rainbow Bridge National Monument as Rainbow Bridge National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1189. A bill to amend title 14 of the United States Code in order to authorize the Coast Guard to carry on certain oceanographic research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Manpower Needs for Defense in the Space Age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to establish the Sesquicentennial Commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property within Chalmette National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar year, 1961, as "Bible Anniversary Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Law Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

RECOGNITION OF DAKOTA CENTENNIAL OBSERVATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. BURDICK), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 101) calling on the people of the United States to give proper recognition to the Dakota centennial observation, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF "LEGISLATION ON FOREIGN RELATIONS WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted a resolution (S. Res. 103) establishing the Select Committee on Technological Developments, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Long of Louisiana, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF AIR FORCE

Mr. BUTLER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 104) to investigate certain activities of the Air Force concerning airfield runways, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUTLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY

Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 105) to create a Special Committee on National Fuels Study, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH, which appears under a separate heading.)

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION OF $1,200 FOR DEPENDENT STUDENTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to provide taxpayers an additional income tax exemption of $1,200 for dependents who are students at institutions of higher learning. This bill also provides the same income tax exemptions for taxpayers who are themselves college or university students.

I first introduced this bill 2 years ago and developments since then have emphasized the need for such legislation. The steadily mounting costs of tuition, books, and other educational expenses are making it more and more difficult for people of moderate means to afford higher education for their children.

For most people, the years when the children are away at school are years of terrible financial burdens, which are becoming impossible for many to carry. The tax exemption provided in this bill would lessen these burdens to a considerable degree. It would also provide needed tax relief for those students who are working their way through college and who need every dollar for educational purposes.

The problem of financing educational costs is more than a personal problem for millions of people. It is a vital national problem and should be recognized as such in our tax laws.

Parents who make the heavy sacrifice required to pay for education, are serving more than their own children. They are making a contribution to the future of their country which is impossible to measure or exaggerate, and they need and deserve the kind of tax assistance provided in this bill.

Congress is now preparing to consider a multi-billion-dollar program of Federal aid to education. In my judgment, this is a necessary program, based upon the premise that our deficiencies in education are a national problem which requires Federal help. I suggest that one important way for the Federal Government to help would be to restore to those taxpayers who are carrying the burden of higher education some of their own tax dollars. This seems to me to be placing first things first.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a student at an institution of higher education, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS FOR TAXPAYER, SPOUSE, OR DEPENDENT ATTENDING INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

"(1) FOR TAXPAYER.—An additional exemption of $1,200 for the taxpayer if (A) during each of 4 calendar months during the taxable year, he is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, and (B) he is not the dependent of another taxpayer.

"(2) FOR SPOUSE.—An additional exemption of $1,200 for the spouse of the taxpayer if a separate return is made by the taxpayer, and if the spouse (A) during each of 4 calendar months during the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, and (B) for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, has no gross income and is not the dependent of another taxpayer.

"(3) DEPENDENTS.—An additional exemption of $1,200 for each dependent (as defined in section 152) (A) with respect to whom the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption under subsection (c)(1), and (B) who, during each of 4 calendar months during the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, is a full-time student at an institution of higher education.

"(4) EXEMPTION DENIED IN CASE OF CERTAIN MARRIED DEPENDENTS.—No exemption shall be allowed under paragraph (3) for any dependent who has made a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins.

"(5) OPTIONAL TAX; DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX.—For purposes of section 4(a) (relating to rules for optional tax) and section 6015(a)(2) relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax), an exemption allowed under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall be treated as two exemptions.

"(6) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in subsection (e)(4)) which—

"(A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(B) is legally authorized within the State in which it is situated to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

"(C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

"(D) is owned and operated by a State, by a political subdivision of a State, or by an agency of a State or political subdivision, or by an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a); and

"(E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited."

SEC. 2. Section 213(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to maximum limitations on deductions for medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by striking out "subsection (c) or (d), relating to the additional exemptions for age or blindness" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c), (d), or (f), relating to certain additional exemptions".

SEC. 3. Section 3402(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to withholding exemptions) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or (C)" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "(C), or (F)";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(4) by adding after subparagraph (E) two new subparagraphs as follows:

"(F) two additional exemptions for himself if, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, there may reasonably be expected to be allowable an exemption under section 151(f)(1) (relating to attending an institution of higher education) for the taxable year under subtitle A in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this chapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit; and

"(G) two exemptions for each individual with respect to whom, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, there may reasonably be expected to be allowable an exemption under section 151(f)(3) for the taxable year under subtitle A in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this chapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act, other than the amendments made by section 3, shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960. The amendments made by section 3 shall apply only with respect to wages paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide compensatory damages for those who may be injured or damaged by deliberate underground detonations of nuclear devices. This has to do particularly with the liability of the U.S. Government with respect to Project Gnome.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a commentary on it may appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 1144) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"m. The United States shall be liable for any bodily injury, sickness, disease or death, or loss of or damage to property, or for loss of use of property, arising out of or resulting from any nuclear incident (except for any nuclear incident arising out of an act of war) caused by the Commission, its agents, employees, contractors or subcontractors, which occurs in the course of the conduct of any activity of the Commission involving the deliberate underground detonation of a nuclear explosive device: *Provided,* That the United States shall not be liable for claims under State or Federal Workmen's Compensation Acts of employees of persons indemnified who are employed at the site of and in connection with the activity where the nuclear incident occurs. The United States shall be liable regardless of whether the nuclear incident involved an act or omission which was negligent or wrongful, or which was based upon the execution of a statute or regulation or upon the exercise or performance of, or failure to exercise or perform, a discretionary function or duty. The district court of the United States for the district in which the nuclear incident occurred shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions against the United States under this subsection. No person shall institute an action against the United States under this subsection if he has been a party plaintiff in an action for damages on which a judgment has been rendered, or if he has settled a claim for damages, under any State or Federal law against the United States or any person indemnified for the same nuclear incident. Judgment on the merits of, or settlement of a claim against the United States under this subsection or under the Federal Tort Claims Act for damages arising

out of or resulting from a nuclear incident shall constitute a release by such person of all claims against persons indemnified for damages arising out of or resulting from the same nuclear incident, except for claims based on damages which were latent and undiscovered at the time of such judgment or settlement. Any action against the United States under this subsection shall be tried by the court without a jury."

SEC. 2. Section 170e of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"e. The aggregate of liability of persons indemnified and of any liability of the United States, including liability under subsection 170m, for a single nuclear incident, including the reasonable costs of investigating and settling claims and defending suits for damage, shall not exceed the sum of $500,000,000 together with the amount of financial protection required of the licensee or contractor. The Commission, the United States, or any person indemnified, may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which the nuclear incident occurred, except that in the case of nuclear incidents caused by ships of the United States outside of the United States, the Commission, or any person indemnified, may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States having venue in bankruptcy matters over the location of the principal place of business of the shipping company owning or operating the ship, and upon a showing that the aggregate of the public liability of persons indemnified, and of the liability of the United States, including liability under subsection 170m from a single nuclear incident, will probably exceed the limit of liability imposed by this section, shall be entitled to such orders as may be appropriate for enforcement of the provisions of this section, including an order limiting the liability of the persons indemnified, and the United States, orders staying the payment of claims and the execution of court judgments, orders apportioning the payments to be made to claimants, orders permitting partial payments to be made before final determination of the total claims, and an order setting aside a part of the funds available for possible latent injuries not discovered until a later time."

SEC. 3. The penultimate sentence of section 170h of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The Commission shall have final authority on behalf of the United States to settle, or approve, the settlement of any such claim or any other claim under this section on a fair and reasonable basis with due regard for the purposes of this Act."

The commentary presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED BILL

The basic purpose of the proposed bill is to provide compensatory damages for those who may be injured or damaged by proposed underground nuclear explosions and, particularly, the proposed detonation of a nuclear device of the 5-kiloton magnitude near Carlsbad, N. Mex. (Project Gnome). While it may be desirable to enact a broader provision covering damages from intentional air bursts or other open air nuclear test operations, the proposed bill is limited to damages from underground blasts, since these are the only nuclear tests presently being proposed.

The basic scheme of the proposed legislation is to amend the Price-Anderson Indemnity Act (sec. 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended), to make the United States liable for damages resulting from such a nuclear detonation. The proposed amendment accordingly utilizes the definitions and concepts contained in existing provisions to the maximum extent feasible. The proposed bill would add a new subsection m to section 170 and would amend slightly the related subsections 170e and 170h.

I

Section 1 of the proposed bill would add a new subsection m to present section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act.

1. The first sentence of proposed new subsection m defines the liability to be imposed on the United States for damages from any underground nuclear detonation. The description of injury and damage is the same as that contained in the definition of "nuclear incident" in section 11o of the act. The provision as drafted is broad enough to include damages resulting both from the intentional underground detonation itself and from any accident which occurs in connection with the conduct of such activity by the Commission or by any of its employees, contractors, or subcontractors. The defined term "nuclear incident" is accordingly used. An exception is included for any nuclear incident arising out of an act of war, and a proviso eliminates liability for Workmen's Compensation Act claims of employees of persons indemnified who are employed at the site of and in connection with the particular activity where the nuclear incident occurs. This proviso is consistent with the other provisions of section 170 of the act and is taken from section 11u, which defines "public liability" for purposes of such other provisions. The concept of "public liability" as so defined is not otherwise utilized in the proposed amendment.

2. The second sentence of new subsection m is included in order to eliminate the possibility that the exceptions contained in the Federal Tort Claims Act might be read into the liability created by this section. If the rule applied to Federal tort claims by the Supreme Court in *Dalehite* v. *United States* (346 U.S. 880), were applied here, it would largely nullify the purposes sought to be accomplished by the proposed bill.

3. The third sentence of proposed subsection m gives jurisdiction of actions based on claims under this subsection to the district court for the district in which the nuclear incident occurs. This is intended to be the same district court as that referred to in existing subsection e of the act, and a clarifying amendment is suggested for subsection e to eliminate any doubt about this (discussed below).

4. The fourth and fifth sentences of proposed subsection m are designed to avoid the possibility of multiple recoveries under the various provisions of section 170 and other statutes, and at the same time to preserve the right to later recovery for latent injuries or other undiscovered damages.

5. The last sentence of subsection m contains a provision comparable to that included in 28 United States Code, section 2402, that actions authorized by it to be brought against the United States shall be tried by the court without a jury.

II

Section 2 of the proposed bill amends present section 170e in several particulars.

1. The first sentence of subsection e is amended to provide specifically that the maximum aggregate liability of $500 million for a single nuclear incident is to include the liability provided under new subsection m.

2. Several comparable technical amendments are made in other corresponding provisions of the subsection to include specific reference to liability of the United States under subsection m.

3. The only other suggested change in subsection e is in the description of the district court contained in the second sentence. The existing provision refers to the "appropriate" district court "having venue in bankruptcy matters over the location of the nuclear incident." This is a confusing reference, because, under the Bankruptcy Act, venue is controlled by such matters as the domicile of the bankrupt or the location of his property, whereas here the legislative history makes it clear that the intent is to give jurisdiction to the district court whose district includes the location of the nuclear incident. Since all district courts of the United States have bankruptcy jurisdiction, it is unnecessary to refer specifically to bankruptcy, and it is accordingly suggested that the section be amended to use the same words used in proposed new subsection m, the "district court of the United States for the district in which the nuclear incident occurred."

III

The only other amendment suggested to section 170 of the act is contained in section 3 of the proposed bill. This adds to the next to last sentence of subsection h with respect to settlement authority the words "or any other claim under this section." This change would make clear that subsection h authorizes settlement of claims against the United States under proposed new subsection m as well as otherwise.

IV

In order to show more clearly the precise changes being made in existing subsections e and h, these subsections are set out in full below with existing language proposed to be changed in black brackets and the new language to be added in italic. All of proposed subsection m, of course, is proposed new language.

"e. [The aggregate liability for a single nuclear incident of persons indemnified,] *The aggregate of liability of persons indemnified and of any liability of the United States including liability under subsection 170m for a single nuclear incident,* including the reasonable costs of investigating and settling claims and defending suits for damage, shall not exceed the sum of $500,000,000 together with the amount of financial protection required of the licensee or contractor. The Commission, *the United States* or any person indemnified may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States [having venue in bankruptcy matters over the location of the nuclear incident,] *for the district in which the nuclear incident occurred,* except that in the case of nuclear incidents caused by ships of the United States outside of the United States, the Commission or any person indemnified may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States having venue in bankruptcy matters over the location of the principal place of business of the shipping company owning or operating the ship, and upon a showing that the *aggregate of the* public liability *of persons indemnified and of the liability of the United States including liability under subsection 170m* from a single nuclear incident will probably exceed the limit of liability imposed by this section, shall be entitled to such orders as may be appropriate for enforcement of the provisions of this section, including an order limiting the liability of the persons indemnified *and the United States,* orders staying the payment of claims and the execution of court judgments, orders apportioning the payments to be made to claimants, orders permitting partial payments to be made before final determination of the total claims, and an order setting aside a part of the funds available for possible latent injuries not discovered until a later time."

"h. The agreement of indemnification may contain such terms as the Commission deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Such agreement shall provide that, when the Commission makes a determination that the United States will probably be required to make indemnity payments

under this section, the Commission shall collaborate with any person indemnified and may approve the payment of any claim under the agreement of indemnification, appear through the Attorney General on behalf of the person indemnified, take charge of such action, and settle or defend any such action. The Commission shall have final authority on behalf of the United States to settle or approve the settlement of any such claim *or any other claim under this section* on a fair and reasonable basis with due regard for the purposes of this act. Such settlement may include reasonable expenses in connection with the claim incurred by the person indemnified."

NATIONAL FOREST ROAD EASEMENTS AND CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as well as a memorandum attached thereto, be printed in the RECORD at this point; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for a week so that other Senators who may be interested in joining me in introducing it may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1151) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for road rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called "Secretary") is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and (2) over any other lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 2. An easement granted under the first section of this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a 5-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within 60 days after receipt of the notice, a hearing before the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture or his representative.

SEC. 3. In order to provide for access to both national forest lands and other public and private lands when in the public interest, the Secretary may enter into mutual agreements for exchange of permanent or temporary—

(1) hauling rights;
(2) rights-of-way;
(3) easements;

or any combination thereof with public agencies and private owners in the vicinity of national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. Financing of roads to be constructed, purchased, exchanged, or condemned may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on national forest timber purchasers, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, and (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with owners of interests in realty, or (4) by a combination of these methods.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located and, if permanently affecting lands reserved from the public domain, shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be held or construed to invalidate or modify any existing rights-of-way across national forest lands or other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, regardless of how evidenced, or any conditions thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate or modify a landowner's right of access to his land.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture may require the user or users of a road under his jurisdiction, including purchasers of Government timber, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. If such maintenance cannot be so provided, or if the Secretary makes a finding that maintenance by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance. Such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and are hereby appropriated and made available until expended as the Secretary may direct, to cover the cost to the United States of the maintenance of roads for which the deposits have been made.

SEC. 8. Determinations made by the Secretary under the provisions of this Act except as provided in section 2 may be appealed to the Secretary by any party adversely affected and a hearing if requested shall be granted. An appeal must be filed within 60 days after the party is notified of the determinations. Presiding at the hearing on appeal will be the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture or his representative.

The memorandum presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

The attached draft of proposed legislation on national forest road easements and construction makes the following changes in law.

Section 1 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for road rights-of-way over (1) all lands under the Department's jurisdiction, and (2) other lands in which the Department may have rights (such as where the Department itself may have been granted some sort of easement). Under existing law the Secretary of the Interior may grant easements over national forest lands reserved from the public domain and the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements over Bankhead-Jones Act lands. No authority exists for the granting of easements over Weeks Act lands. The Secretary of Agriculture may, however, issue revocable permits for the use of any lands under the Department's jurisdiction.

Under the act of June 4, 1897, owners of lands within national forests have the right of ingress and egress over public domain national forest lands. This right would not be affected by the bill.

Section 3 of the draft bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements for the exchange of hauling rights, rights-of-way, and easements. The Secretary can accept grants of easements at present and may condition the issuance of revocable permits upon reciprocal grants, but cannot give permanent easements that would constitute good consideration for the reciprocal grant.

We understand that this section probably was intended to relate only to road easements, as does the rest of the bill. However, the language is broad enough to cover all access easements and would therefore constitute new authority for the granting of easements for which authority does not now exist.

The remainder of the draft appears largely ancillary to sections 1 and 3. Section 2 contains provisions for termination of road easements granted under section 1. Section 4 provides for methods of financing road construction and acquisition, and we understand the only new authority under it would be that of providing amortization of road costs in timber contracts.

Section 5 provides for recording. Section 6 preserves existing access laws. Section 7 provides for charging road users maintenance costs and appropriates such charges for road maintenance. This would be new authority although the Department may now require maintenance by the user or accept deposits from him. Section 8 provides for appeals.

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to consolidate and improve the existing legislative base for the international educational and cultural exchange programs carried out and supported by the U.S. Government.

It has been amply clear for a long time that our exchange programs—which are among the most important elements in the foreign policy posture of the United States—have been limping along under severe restraints. These restrictions are found in three broad areas: the inadequacies of legislative authority, the short-range and uncertain character of the financing for the programs, and the confusing administrative arrangements which have been created to implement a variety of exchanges.

The basic problem, however, is that educational and cultural exchange programs have grown up in an ad hoc, piecemeal way since their modest beginnings roughly two decades ago. They now operate under at least half a dozen pieces of legislation, most of which were passed without much consideration of the others. At the same time, there has been a good deal of uncertainty as to the relationship of the various exchange programs to overall American foreign policy. Yet one thing is certain: The approach to the international scene appropriate to the 1940's is not good enough for the 1960's.

We thus decided last summer that a congressional initiative was vitally needed for the improvement of our educational and cultural exchange programs. This decision was taken with the knowledge that both presidential

candidates had shown great interest in the subject and that a new administration, regardless of the electoral outcome, would give a high priority to action in this field. We also felt that, owing to campaign pressures and uncertainties, the Senate would be in the best position to direct the protracted study and work involved in creating a new legislative approach.

Accordingly, we began by convening an informal 2-day conference last October attended by high-level educators and governmental officials most conversant with the operations of the exchange programs. Incidentally, one of the participants was the head of the Rockefeller Foundation, now Secretary of State Dean Rusk. There was remarkable unanimity of feeling among the group concerning the urgent need for a new approach to the question of international exchanges. Specifically, there was clear agreement on four major requirements. First, the need to restate the purpose of the programs, particularly in terms of insisting on the mutual character of the benefits to be derived by the United States and participating nations. Second, the need for stronger and more varied financial support, including broader and more flexible use of foreign currencies. Third, the need for removing hampering restrictions on the programs so that better planning and performance can be achieved, with respect to not only official but also private endeavors in this area. Fourth, the need to develop and enrich American educational resources in terms of making better use of them both at home and abroad.

This meeting was the touchstone of our further efforts toward creating the draft legislation which is now being introduced. We are extremely grateful to the prominent individuals who embarked on this venture with us and who continue to give their wise counsel. There will be occasion later to make a more generous acknowledgment of their help.

There naturally have been differing views about the scope of the needed initiative. A good case can be made for an attempt to recast and strengthen the entire range of international educational and cultural programs; this would entail profound study and sweeping reorganization of many parts of the executive branch. We are not opposed in theory to this large-scale, or shooting-for-the-stars approach. Yet, for a number of reasons, it does not seem to hold the promise of needed early action. On the other side of the coin, it could be argued that the Fulbright, Smith-Mundt, and other relevant pieces of legislation might simply be amended in places to correct the more obvious deficiencies. But this approach only perpetuates the difficulty we are experiencing in making a patchwork collection of legislation serve the requirements of this new period in our history.

Therefore, we have tried to achieve the "golden mean"—if I may be forgiven the use of such a controversial adjective. Basically, this bill has the purposes of consolidating in one piece of legislation many existing provisions of law governing the exchange programs, and of authorizing increases in the size and scope of such programs wherever they would contribute to the current or long-range improvement of our foreign relations.

The bill deals primarily—but far from exclusively—with academic and cultural exchange-of-persons programs of the kind now carried out or generally supervised by the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency. It does not attempt to go deeply into the ICA activities in the education field which are authorized by the Mutual Security Act, although it should be remembered that such activities in the last analysis are under the direction of the Secretary of State. Moreover, though it is difficult to make concrete distinctions, the more strictly informational activities of the USIA have not been touched upon; the bulk of the Smith-Mundt Act therefore is left intact. Finally—and this also is particularly relevant to any possible accusations that we are seeking to show partiality in the tangled field of departmental jurisdiction—the bill grants authority to the President to determine the organizational structure needed to give it effect.

The detailed provisions of this bill are too many and varied in number to permit summary treatment in these introductory remarks. We anticipate that a section-by-section analysis will soon be ready and available for insertion in the RECORD. We also expect that full-scale hearings on the bill will be conducted before the Committee on Foreign Relations. There will thus be ample opportunity for searching inquiry into the merits and possible demerits of this proposed legislation. However, I should mention that there are two sections which relate to matters within the primary jurisdiction of the Finance and Judiciary Committees. The amendments contained therein are important to the educational and cultural exchange programs but otherwise minor in character. I have solicited the views of the chairmen of those committees in order that there be no confusion about the referral of the bill.

Mr. President, I should not like this occasion to pass without saying that this bill, above all, is intended to improve the effectiveness of our educational and cultural exchange programs. It is true that there is a vital need for broadened programs in certain areas, and the bill would permit this. The main theme, however, is the search for quality—not in terms of opposition to quantity but in terms of the best interests of our relations with other countries. I would echo Secretary Rusk's view "that the * * * fundamental principle on which we operate might well be that we either do it right or not do it at all." This bill is designed "to do it right."

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

The bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FORT SMITH NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes.

The city of Fort Smith now owns or is in the process of acquiring title to most of the land which will be involved in the establishing of this facility.

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

The bill (S. 1155) authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES OF PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD, HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] and myself, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted, would provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii.

The matter of inequitable wage rates prevailing at the Naval Shipyard in Hawaii has long been of concern to me. There is a discrepancy between wage rates at that shipyard and at West Coast shipyards such as Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco and Puget Sound.

The legal basis for the Department of the Navy's wagefixing actions for ungraded employees in Public Law 1028, 84th Congress (70A Stats. 463; 10 U.S.C. 7474), which reads in part:

> The Secretary of the Navy shall establish rates of wages for employees of each Naval activity where the rates are not established by other provisions of law to conform, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest, with those of private establishments in the immediate vicinity.

In accordance with this law, rates of pay for the ungraded employees of Pearl Harbor are based on rates paid by industrial firms in the Honolulu area.

The present Navy Department's wage policies as applied to the Honolulu area are unrealistic. There are no private enterprises in the Honolulu area that carry on heavy shipbuilding or ship repair work. The closest similar industry can only be found on the west coast. In many instances of specialized types of work, there are no private enterprises in the Honolulu area that employ personnel for the type of work that is done at Pearl Harbor.

I am informed that it has been extremely difficult to recruit skilled mechanics from Honolulu's limited labor

market. It has become almost impossible to hire qualified local electricians, linemen, or cable splicers. My information is also that electronics technicians are very difficult to hire, with the result being that a practice of temporary loan of personnel from the west coast naval shipyards has been put into effect. These temporary employees are paid west coast wage rates, yet work side by side with and do the same work as regular Pearl Harbor workers.

At the present time, the Department of the Navy is conducting an area wage survey in Hawaii. This type of survey is made periodically for the purpose of adjusting wages wherever it is felt necessary. It is my sincere hope that the Navy will see fit to adjust the wages upward to compare with San Francisco standards.

In connection with the present wage survey, I would like to point out the fact that job duties of the private firms being surveyed are not comparable to the job duties of the employees of the Defense Department. The firms surveyed in the Honolulu area hire only maintenance tradesmen which cannot be compared to the tradesmen employed by the Pearl Harbor Shipyard. Also, wage surveys in the past have not included construction companies and job shops in the Honolulu area. The explanation given is that the construction industry is of a seasonal nature.

Unlike other areas on the mainland, construction goes on the year round in Hawaii. The industry is stable and not subject to fluctuations. For the last 10 years, we have seen a tremendous growth in the industry. I hope that the Navy wage board will take into consideration surveying the leading firms in the industry in setting the wages for the Hawaii area.

Under the provisions of section 7474 of title 10, United States Code, it has been the policy of the Navy to use the "public interest" authority in its wage fixing only if problems of turnover or recruitment make it difficult to carry on the Navy's business. I submit that the Navy has the authority under the language of the law and should exercise that authority in the fixing of wages of employees in the Honolulu area.

I am convinced that this is a case where an exception should be made; that changes are necessary because of the difficulty in recruiting technicians, the problem of high turnover, the morale problem and because there are no comparable industries in Honolulu on which to base valid comparisons.

It is unfair that ungraded employees at the Pearl Harbor yard, performing the same type of work as those of the San Francisco yard, are not receiving the same rates of pay. The cost of living in Honolulu is higher than in the San Francisco area. Under the Pearl Harbor wage rates for benchmark trades—machinists, pipefitters, shipfitters, and so forth—the prevailing wage is $2.71. The comparable San Francisco wage is $2.96; a difference of 25 cents. Similar differences are found throughout the entire wage scale.

Classified Federal employees in Hawaii are given a 17½ percent cost-of-living differential. Ungraded employees do not receive this differential. I point this out merely as an illustration that the various divisions of our Federal Government are aware of the high cost of living and the necessity for some sort of equalizer in Hawaii.

Mr. President, it is not my wish that Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard employees receive any higher wages than their counterparts in the San Francisco area, even though our cost of living may be higher. It is my wish only that they be treated equally and that their pay reflect the true value of their work.

I need not emphasize the strategic importance of Pearl Harbor as a repair and overhaul facility. It is the nerve center for our Far Eastern and Pacific defenses. In time of emergency or conflict in the western Pacific, Pearl Harbor would be the nearest U.S. naval shipyard at which our naval vessels can stop for major overhauls and repair work.

It is most important that its capability be maintained at the highest possible level. It is imperative that our excellent naval shipyard, 2,200 miles from the mainland, be prepared for any emergency and prepared for any task, however large.

This capability can be achieved only by providing adequate wage rates which will attract qualified employees, reduce the rate of turnover, and raise the morale of the personnel that operate the facility. All that we ask is equality.

I hope to achive this equality through this bill and I ask my colleagues to give early and favorable consideration to this bill.

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

The bill (S. 1156) to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii, introduced by Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

IMMIGRATION QUOTA FOR THE RYUKYUS

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that world conditions require the United States to continue its military occupation of the strategically important Ryukyu Islands in the Pacific. Our country is fortunate, however, that the people of the Ryukyus are loyal supporters of the United States. Their friendly attitude helps immeasurably in safeguarding our security in that part of the world.

It was my privilege to visit the Ryukyus last December with Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska, as members of a special study group of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We were both deeply impressed by the friendliness of the Ryukyan people. We were heartened by the local elections which were held there shortly before our visit. The pro-American slate of candidates won by a landslide.

Among the conclusions which Senator GRUENING and I reached as a result of our visit to the Ryukyus and a study of the problems there, is the need for legislation to grant the Ryukyans a quota for immigration to the United States. We are therefore introducing a bill to that effect for consideration by the appropriate committee and the Senate.

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

The bill (S. 1157) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States had jurisdiction under a treaty shall be treated as a separate quota area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this age of scientific miracles, the strides that are being made in medicine are phenomenal. As Howard K. Smith reported on the excellent CBS television show last month entitled "The Business of Health: Medicine, Money and Politics":

> We are caught in a medical revolution that is producing an explosion of technical and scientific techniques. In the span of a few short years, we have advanced from the country doctor to the specialist—from the horse and buggy to the betatron.

Thanks to the wonders of modern medicine, we can look forward to healthier and longer lives. Each day brings new triumphs in medicine. We are indebted to the dedicated physicians and those in related fields who are doing so much to win the battle against illness and disease.

The great strides being made in the field of medicine have given rise to new and complex problems. One of these problems is the heavy financial costs of modern medicine. The new medical techniques and equipment necessarily mean a steep rise in medical costs. This is a problem with which we are all only too familiar. This is a problem not only for those receiving medical treatment but for hospitals and physicians as well.

This high cost of modern medicine is being acutely felt in the more sparsely populated areas of our great country. The days of the horse-and-buggy doctor are a thing of the past. Today's physician, to do his job properly, requires an up-to-date medical office, equipment and laboratory facilities. All too often our smaller communities do not have such facilities and, as a result, quite understandably few of our graduating physicians desire to practice in such areas. It is only natural that they would prefer to establish a practice in metropolitan centers where the required medical equipment and facilities are readily available.

In order to attract an adequate supply of physicians to our smaller communities increasing attention is being given to the formation of voluntary nonprofit associations which offer prepaid health service programs. Through such associations it is possible to construct neces-

sary modern medical facilities equipped with up-to-date equipment which today's physicians require. These associations through obtaining a community pool of funds, derived from prepayments, also assure an adequate income to the participating physicians regardless of the dips and rises in the local economy.

Over 8 years ago President Truman's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation recommended that Federal loans be made to local organizations desiring to institute prepayment plans associated with group practice, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of group practice facilities.

In the past several Congresses I have introduced legislation in accord with this recommendation, and I introduce this bill entitled the "Health Services Facilities Act" again today.

My bill provides that if a group of people in a community where health facilities are inadequate get together and form a voluntary health plan organization and be prepared to assume the financial responsibility for working out their own problem, they then may apply for low-interest, long-term loans from the Federal Government to enable them to finance the facilities which their community requires.

I hope, Mr. President, that this bill will be given early consideration. In my judgment, we should be doing all that we possibly can to encourage people at the local community level in solving their medical-care problems.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that my bill provides for loans—not grants—to these voluntary associations. The money will be repaid to the Government with interest and it will be a sound and wise investment.

I do not, and I know of no one in this body who does, want to see the government at the Federal, State, or local level control medicine. The alternative to Government control or a program of socialized medicine is the encouragement of the formation of voluntary groups to meet the medical needs of the people. In my judgment, our Government should be stimulating that kind of association. And that is what my bill seeks to do.

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

The bill (S. 1158) to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide increased authorizations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963, for the development of forest roads and trails. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement prepared by me relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1159) to provide increased authorizations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963, for forest development roads and trails, Indian reservation roads, and public lands highways, and to provide authorization for the construction of national forest recreation and access roads, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

The bill which I am introducing is intended to authorize an increase in the forest road and trail program from $35 million for fiscal year 1962 and $40 million for fiscal year 1963 to $45 million for fiscal year 1962 and $55 million for fiscal year 1963.

The bill would, in addition, authorize a program for the construction of forest recreation and access roads by the Forest Service. The amounts authorized would be $25 million for fiscal year 1962 and $25 million for fiscal year 1963.

The public lands road authorization would be increased from $3.5 million and $3 million to $7 million and $6 million for fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The Indian roads authorization would be increased from $12 million to $17 million for fiscal years 1962 and 1963.

In his message relative to natural resources the President, among other things, mentioned the need for improved forest management, to make supplies of merchantable timber available to small businesses, and to aid the small private owners in attaining better forest management standards and more efficient production and utilization of forest crops. In connection with this program the President has directed the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to accelerate the program of building approved access roads to public forests. In addition, the President referred to the recreation needs of our country and to the fact that millions of visitor days are now spent in federally owned parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and water reservoirs.

If the President requests the various agencies to accelerate the program of access roads to timbered areas, it may be necessary to increase the authorizations for both fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The bill would permit a larger program without utilizing part of the authorization now in effect for fiscal year 1963. The bill would be consistent with the President's plan to provide much-needed development roads into our national forests for timber management and harvesting.

The portion of the bill dealing with recreation and access roads will supplement the forest roads and trails program, and in addition, take into account the importance of providing access for visitors into and through the national forests. In connection with this particular program, consideration would be given to the recreation needs as well as to the intercommunity connections which might be provided by these roads. In other words, roads such as those leading from Taos through Twining to the Red River, New Mexico, could be constructed under this program, also roads such as those from Silver City, N. Mex., into the Gila cliff dwellings and to the wilderness area could be constructed under this authorization. Many other areas in my State could also benefit from such a program as well as many similar areas throughout the United States.

These forest roads and trails, forest recreation and access roads, public lands roads, and Indian roads would all furnish much-needed employment in our country and would also be consistent with the views of the President in connection with a program of assisting small timber operators and enhancing the recreational opportunities.

USE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to correct an injustice at the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation and to harmonize the legislation affecting the use of land in the reservoirs of the Missouri River. The Garrison Dam in North Dakota was one of the first dams for which Indian land was taken and land belonging to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation was taken under the act of October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1026). Subsequently, the United States took land from four other tribes: The Standing Rock, the Cheyenne River, the Crow Creek, and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribes for the Oahe and Fort Randall projects and in the case of these four tribes, special grazing rights were given to the tribes on the land between the taking line and the shoreline. The purpose of this bill is to place the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation in substantially the same position with the other tribes, and to correct an injustice now existing with respect to this group.

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

The bill (S. 1161) to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, introduced by Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide tax relief for college and high school students and their parents.

Nothing is more important right now than the proper education of the young people of the United States. We must have an educated America if we are to have a strong America, a soundly progressive America.

As Senators know, the costs of providing this education are constantly rising. But no costs are too high to provide our youth with the best possible training for citizenship—for today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to allow an additional income tax exemption for high school and college students or to those on whom they depend for support. The bill proposes an additional

exemption of $1,200 a year for a full-time college student and an exemption of $400 a year for a full-time high school student.

If the parents or other providers for an individual are supporting the student as he pursues his education, they would receive the exemption. If the individual is putting himself through high school or college by his own efforts, he would receive the exemption.

The purpose of the bill is simple. My aim is to provide some badly needed assistance to students and to parents who in many cases are making considerable sacrifices in order to educate their children.

College costs in particular have advanced enormously in the last 10 years. Even with the best will in the world, more and more parents are finding the burden of getting their sons and daughters through college harder and harder to carry. This bill provides a practical way of easing that burden.

Mr. President, this type of educational aid does not infringe upon the rights of the States or of the local committees in the field of education. I believe it is important and necessary that we avoid such infringement.

We can improve our educational opportunities without laying ourselves open to Federal control of local schools. I believe the bill I am offering would result in the advancement of that ideal.

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

The bill (S. 1162) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a full-time college student and an additional income tax exemption of $400 for an individual who is a full-time high school student, introduced by Mr. BLAKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ABOLITION OF AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT UNDER FEDERAL CONTRACTS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to outlaw discrimination because of age in the personnel and employment policies of Federal contractors or subcontractors.

This bill, entitled "The Equality of Employment Opportunities for Older Workers Act," also requires periodic regional meetings of labor and employer groups to evaluate the desirability and practical benefits of employing older workers. The bill also calls for surveys of compliance with the purposes of the act.

Last June in introducing similar legislation, I pointed out that the hearings of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging included much testimony on the plight of the man or woman too old to work in the opinion of employment offices, but too young to retire under social security and private pension plans.

Senator MCCARTHY's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems also gathered material and published extensive reports on this matter, and I am sure Senator CLARK, during this session of the Congress, is confronted with the same problem in his Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

For the individual between 40 and 65, the present unemployment crisis is tragic enough, without his also having to fight the prejudices and wrong ideas about his abilities to work. Many of them, if not most of them, still have families to support, and have great financial obligations.

The bill does not seek to place older workers at a greater advantage than younger ones. It only aims at making their chances equal to those of younger jobseekers.

The Federal Government certainly should exert leadership in abolishing discrimination in employment solely because of age by insisting on such equality in the contracts it has with private employers.

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

The bill (S. 1166) to eliminate discriminatory employment practices for reasons of age, by Federal Government contractors and subcontractors, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanation presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL FOR "EQUALITY OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR OLDER WORKERS ACT"

This bill declares that ability and not age should be the criterion for hiring and retaining employees, and calls for the elimination of employment discrimination because of age.

The bill provides:

1. A declaration of policy that the practice of arbitrary denial of employment opportunities solely because of age be eliminated.

2. The President is directed to insure that contractors and subcontractors of the United States observe personnel policies for all applicants and employees aged 25 through 64 in accordance with the above policy.

3. Compliance with this policy is a condition for approving Government contracts and subcontracts.

4. The Secretary of Labor is directed to hold conferences in various sections of the country between labor and management to spread widely the facts with respect to performance ability of older workers.

5. The Secretary of Labor is further directed to conduct studies of progress in this field and report to the Congress.

HERBERT KAEMPF

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Herbert Kaempf. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1177) for the relief of Herbert Kaempf, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

STATEMENT ACCOMPANYING BILL FOR RELIEF OF HERBERT KAEMPF

The bill for the relief of Herbert Kaempf would allow him to be considered as having resided in and as having been physically present in the United States for a 10-year period immediately prior to 1959. The purpose of this bill is to satisfy an Immigration and Nationality Act requirement that, in the event that a child is born abroad to parents, one of whom is an alien and the other a citizen of the United States, for the child to become a citizen of the United States at birth the citizen parent must physically have been present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling 10 years, at least 5 of which were after attaining 14 years of age.

Herbert Kaempf was born in 1930 in Czechoslovakia of German parents. He emigrated to the United States in 1952, and he enlisted in the U.S. Air Force later that year. On October 23, 1953, Kaempf was naturalized. In 1957 Kaempf married a German girl and they resided in England, where he was stationed. In May 1959, a son was born to the Kaempfs in an American hospital in England.

Not until Sergeant Kaempf was preparing to return to the United States later that year, having been transferred, and was seeking an American passport for his infant son, did he discover that his son was not a citizen of the United States because of the regulation of the Immigration and Nationality Act cited above.

The only reason why the son of Sergeant Kaempf is not considered native-born is because he was born outside the United States to parents one of whom is not a U.S. citizen. Nevertheless, the reason he was born outside the United States is because his father, Sergeant Kaempf, was stationed there with the U.S. Air Force. If by mere chance Sergeant Kaempf had been assigned to a location within the United States by the Air Force, his son would have been born in the United States and thus have become a U.S. citizen at birth without question.

Sergeant Kaempf is about to graduate from Electronics Training School at Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss. He and his family will soon be assigned to Almaden Air Force Base, New Almaden, Calif. They have set up permanent residence in Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish, La., where the sergeant is a registered and participating voter. There is no question that the Kaempfs are intending to remain in the United States and that the son will be brought up as an American. The only question is whether the son will have to become a citizen through naturalization or whether he may be granted citizenship as a birthright.

Because of the unusualness of the situation which finds a boy, for all intents and purposes an American citizen by birth, denied such birthright due to a curious combination of happenstance and restrictive law, petition is made for relief which will ultimately allow the boy to gain this birthright.

NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL ACT OF 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to establish

a national productivity council with authority to organize voluntary councils on a community, regional, or industry basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for other Senators to join in sponsoring it, if they so desire, until the close of business on March 8. The bill follows closely the bill I introduced in the last Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1181) to promote mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management in order to increase productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, through the establishment of a National Productivity Council and the promotion of local and industrywide councils, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am introducing the bill because I believe one of the major problems of our country is productivity. I believe that the White House Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which, incidentally, is patterned after the National Productivity Council proposed in my bill, was established on February 16 by President Kennedy in an Executive order is not adequate to do the job that we must undertake to do, and which needs very much to be done. That job must be done on a plant level and on a community level. It is not doing the job which my bill contemplates doing.

The chief aims of the councils to which I have referred would be to accelerate national productivity by promoting peaceful labor-management relations and by solving problems caused by inflexible prices, the wage-price squeeze, featherbedding, and other economic sore spots which have been slowing the U.S. productivity rate.

In addition, the councils would endeavor to ameliorate the problems caused by the displacement of workers through automation.

I wish to make it clear that I believe the President of the United States has done an excellent thing in setting up an advisory committee on labor-management policy; but I think that action should now be implemented by law, so as to get money to bring the activity down to plant and local levels, in order that we may have grassroots participation. That is the purpose of my bill. It would establish an operating agency and create functioning agencies throughout the country to stimulate productivity on the local level, where such productivity can do the most good.

This is no new idea; it is nothing which has suddenly been invented. During the war we had 5,000 precisely such councils functioning on the local level. They had much to do with the reduction of absenteeism, dealing with efficiency, eliminating featherbedding, and dealing with problems of automation. They did precisely what I suggest should now be done.

I wish also to point out that Canada has now passed legislation to establish exactly this kind of system and exactly this kind of procedure. Our sister Commonwealth to the north feels that it is facing precisely the same problem.

It is a fact that there is a very dangerous gap in the economic growth rate between the United States and the Soviet Union. This will have grave consequences to our national security, and eventually even to our standard of living. We must reduce to the minimum the controllable wastes of our manpower, resources, and economic production machine. For example, in terms of strikes, last year 20 million man-days of work were lost as a result of labor-management disputes. Aside from the strikes, 5,500,000 people are idle. There is fear of discrimination on grounds of race, creed, or color. There are problems of automation. There are fears of workers being displaced. Not only are there problems relating to labor; there are problems relating to management. Many other problems must be dealt with in terms of management as they relate to the waste of manpower. There are problems relating to featherbedding in labor, whether by operation of law in respect to railroads and some other functions, or by collective bargaining, or in some other way, thus depriving the Nation of the full potential of America's production machine.

I consider the bill I am introducing today to be one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation for which I am responsible. The reason is that it goes to so critical an aspect of our national lives, and it is so critical an element of winning the cold war. I say advisedly that I know of no more important function that I can serve on the floor of the Senate for the people of my State and as a Senator for the people of the whole Nation than equipping ourselves effectively to fight the struggle for freedom, the toughest struggle for survival that mankind has ever known.

In my opinion, that is the problem which is the hard rock on which our ship may founder. So I am privileged to be able, as a Senator from New York, to try to make some contribution to solving the problem. It is in that frame of reference that I have introduced the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered into the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Productivity Council Act of 1961".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDING

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the national interest requires the promotion of an increased rate of national productivity, in order to meet the challenges presented by increased foreign and domestic competition, the requirements for expansion of exports and the maintenance of a flexible import policy, the threat of growing Communist power and the continuing responsibilities of the United States as they relate to the maintenance of its domestic economic strength and its international economic position. The Congress further finds and declares that the problems resulting from efforts to achieve such an increased rate of national productivity through accelerated automation and other technological and managerial changes can best be solved through cooperative action between labor and management while preserving the traditional areas of responsibility and interest of each.

NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch an independent agency to be known as the "National Productivity Council" (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall be composed of 25 members as follows:

(1) The Vice President of the United States who shall be the Chairman of the Council;

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration;

(3) Four members who shall be representative of management in large and small businesses (as defined by the Small Business Administration) in manufacturing and service industries (including transportation);

(4) Four members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(5) Two members who shall be representative of management in extractive and agricultural industries;

(6) Two members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(7) Three members who are recognized experts in labor-management relations, at least two of whom shall be from the academic field; and

(8) Three members who shall be representative of the general public, and who shall be selected without regard to any interest or connection they may have with any of the foregoing areas.

(b) Members of the Council referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall be appointed by the President for terms of six years, except that of the members first appointed six shall be appointed for terms of two years, six shall be appointed for terms of four years, and six shall be appointed for terms of six years. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of such term.

(c) The Council shall meet at least four times each year at such times as it shall determine. A quorum shall consist of 13 members.

(d) Members of the Council referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem while performing services for the Council, and while away from their homes in connection with attendance at meetings of the Council shall be entitled to transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate prescribed by or established pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(e) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Executive Director of the Council. The Executive Director shall be the principal executive officer of the Council and shall be paid compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Council is

authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations, and fix the compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such other officers and employees as may be necessary.

(f) With the consent of the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government, the Council is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of such departments and agencies in carrying out its functions under this Act. Such departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Council to the greatest extent practicable for such purpose.

(g) The Council shall transmit to the President and to the Congress an annual report of its activities under this Act.

OBJECTIVES OF COUNCIL

SEC. 4. It shall be the objective of the Council—

(1) To enlist the cooperation of labor, management, and State and local governments, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, toward the implementation of the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment activities, including self-employment, for those willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

(2) To promote peaceful labor-management relations;

(3) To promote a climate of cooperation and understanding between labor and management and the community, and the recognition by labor and management of the public interest in harmonious labor-management relations;

(4) To promote the maintenance and improvement of worker morale and to enlist community interest in increasing productivity and reducing waste and absenteeism;

(5) To promote the more effective use of labor and management personnel in the interest of increased productivity; and

(6) To stimulate programs through which the social and economic problems of individual workers and of management personnel adversely affected by automation or other technological change or the relocation of industries may be ameliorated.

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) In order to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4, the Council shall encourage and assist in the organization of labor-management-public councils and similar groups designed to further such objectives, on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis, and to provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in attaining such objectives. Such assistance shall include—

(1) Aid in the development of apprenticeship, training, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater and more diversified skills;

(2) Aid in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism;

(3) Aid in the revision of building codes, zoning regulations, and other local ordinances and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to changing economic conditions;

(4) Aid in planning for the provision of adequate transportation for the labor force and the promotion of employee safety and health;

(5) The encouragement of attendance by members of such groups at courses in industrial relations at institutions of higher education, and the fostering of close cooperation between such groups and such institutions for the purpose of developing such courses and for other purposes; and

(6) The encouragement of studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (1) to (5) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries.

(b) The Council shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4.

POWERS OF COUNCIL

SEC. 6. (a) The Council shall carry out the functions referred to in section 5 through—

(1) The dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives;

(2) The dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities;

(3) The utilization of the services and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of such other governmental agencies, private groups, and professional experts as it deems necessary;

(4) The coordination of such services and facilities in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public groups designed to further the objectives set forth in section 4;

(5) Grants to groups or individuals for financing up to 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out any project or program, including the setting up of local, regional, or industry-wide labor-management-public groups, in furtherance of the objectives of the Council, but financial assistance shall not be provided under this paragraph in connection with any one project or program for a period in excess of three years, and not more than a total of $——— shall be expended in any year for such purposes; and

(6) Establishment of regional or industry-wide advisory committees to advise the Council on ways and means to best fulfill its functions and to convene regional and industry-wide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 4.

(b) The Council may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the United States grows and develops, different kinds of problems face our citizens. One of these problems is that we are running out of air. It arises because of the increase in the number of automobiles and the expansion of our industrial tempo. We are running out of air because of garbage in the sky. It is to this question of air pollution that my bill is directed.

To draw attention to something that Senators think is of national importance, we use words like "crisis" or "disaster." But, these words imply a difficulty that has become suddenly current. Air pollution as a national problem has been creeping up on us for decades.

It is difficult to dramatize dirty air. We are not yet at the point where we are in danger of immediate death because of one whiff of contaminated air. Crops are not ruined overnight because of a dusting with polluted air. Filth and corrosion take time to become manifest.

But, this does not mean to say that there is no problem. It merely requires the Congress to focus on it through a longer-term lens. Air pollution is subtle, silent and continuing.

In 1955, we began to study the problem of air pollution through the offices of the Surgeon General. To be sure, this research has not given us all the answers. But we have enough knowledge about action to be taken to heed the President's injunction, "Let us begin."

The President, in his recent message to Congress on natural resources, indicated that he proposes to establish a special unit within the Public Health Service to provide new leadership, research and financial and technical assistance for the control of air pollution, a serious hazard to the health of our people that causes an estimated $7.5 billion annually in damage to vegetation, livestock, metals and other materials. We need an effective air pollution control program now. For although the total supply of air is vast, the atmosphere over our growing metropolitan areas—where more than half the people live—has only limited capacity to dilute and disperse the contaminants now being discharged from homes, factories, vehicles, and many other sources.

The legislation I propose has two major objectives. First, it would extend the time and increase the appropriation available to the Surgeon General for research into further problems of air pollution.

Second, it would permit the Surgeon General to take definite direct action to abate air pollution through a system of hearings and orders similar to those provided in the Blatnik-Humphrey water pollution control bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lay on the table for 3 days so that other Senators wishing to join with me in this measure may have an opportunity to become cosponsors of this bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and that an article, "Pollution in the Air We Breath," from the August 1960 edition of Consumer Reports be printed after the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1187) to amend the Federal air pollution control law to provide for a more effective program of air pollution control, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the Federal air pollution control law to provide for a more effective program of air pollution control, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide

research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control," approved July 14, 1955 (42 U.S.C. 1857b), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General may conduct investigations and research and make surveys (including holding public hearings) concerning any problem of air pollution confronting a State or local government air pollution control agency or of concern to the Nation or any area thereof with a view to recommending a solution to such problem.

"(b) (1) The Surgeon General shall, after conducting such research as may be necessary, determine standards as to the amount of unburned hydrocarbons, noxious gases and other pollutants, which are safe from the standpoint of human health, for discharge into the atmosphere.

"(2) After the determination of such standards the Surgeon General shall use his authority under the provisions of this Act to the extent necessary to develop effective and practical devices to control the discharge of pollutants into the air within the limits of such standards.

"(3) The Surgeon General shall report annually to the President and the Congress his progress in carrying out the provisions of this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of such Act of July 14, 1955 (42 U.S.C. 1857d), is amended by striking out "for each of the nine fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1964, not to exceed $5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year such sum as may be necessary".

SEC. 3. Such Act of July 14, 1955, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, State, interstate, and local action to abate pollution of the air shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a final order issued in accordance with subsection (e) of this section or a court order under subsection (g) of this section.

"(c) (1) Whenever requested by either the Governor of any State, or a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor or of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Surgeon General shall give formal notification of any air pollution to the State air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such air pollution originate and shall call promptly a conference of the State air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate and of the State or States, which may be adversely affected by such pollution. Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, has reason to believe that air pollution is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is occurring, he may call such a conference on his own initiative.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of the air subject to abatement under this section; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any person is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State air pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e) If at the conclusion of such six-month period such remedial action is not taken or action which in the judgment of the Surgeon General is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a Hearing Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Hearing Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State air pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence any person alleged to be discharging matter contributing to the pollution, abatement of which is sought, may be joined as a party to such hearing if the fact of such alleged pollution does not become known until after such notice has been given. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Hearing Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the Hearing Board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. Such findings and recommendations shall be the findings and recommendations of the Secretary except to the extent, on the basis of the evidence at such hearing, he believes additional or different findings or recommendations are warranted. The Secretary shall send his findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with an order specifying a reasonable time but not less than six months from date of issuance of such order to secure abatement of such pollution in accordance with such findings and recommendations. Such order shall become final on the sixtieth day after the date of its issuance. The Secretary shall also send a copy of such findings and recommendations and such order to the air pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, attending the hearings.

"(f) An appeal may be taken from any such order of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by any person who has been made subject to such order to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to the pollution subject to abatement by such order originates by filing with such court a notice of appeal within sixty days from the date of issuance of the order. The jurisdiction of the court shall attach upon the filing of such notice. A copy of such notice shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary or any officer designated by him for that purpose and to any other person who received a copy of the Secretary's order. The Secretary shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings before the Hearing Board as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code, together with his findings of fact and recommendations. Such findings of the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole, shall be conclusive, but the court for good cause shown may remand the case to the Secretary for the taking of additional evidence in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The Secretary may thereupon make or cause to be made new or modified findings of fact and recommendations, and he shall file with the court the record of such further proceedings, the new or modified findings and recommendations, and his recommendations, if any, for the setting aside or modification of his original order. Such new or modified findings shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole.

"(g) Upon the basis of the record of the proceedings filed with it, the court shall have jurisdiction to enter an order affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The judgment of the court shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(h) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of any civil action brought by the Attorney General at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enforce any order issued under this section by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by a United States Court of Appeals.

"(i) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(j) As used in this section, the term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"(k) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $25,000,000 for an Enforcement Construction Grant Fund. The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants from such Fund to any State, municipality, or interstate agency requested or required by the Commissioner or the Secretary to construct remedial facilities after a conference, hearing, or court action. Such grants shall be for the purpose of providing financial assistance in the construction of such remedial facilities, and shall be made only if sufficient need therefor is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Surgeon General. No projects receiving grants from funds appropriated pursuant to section 5 of this Act shall receive any moneys from such Grant Fund. Sums appropriated for such Grant Fund shall remain available until expended, and shall be allotted in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

The article presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

POLLUTION IN THE AIR WE BREATHE

CU reports herewith on a substance each of us consumes, awake and asleep, from birth to death, at an average rate of some 6,000 gallons daily: the air we breathe.

The quality of the air has been deteriorating progressively as the population has increased and our industrial operations have multiplied. From the moment primitive man first learned to kindle a fire, he used the seemingly limitless ocean of air around him as a sewer to carry off the wastes of combustion. And we have followed his precedent ever since. By the time complex industrial processes began to generate chemical fumes and gases as well as smoke, the habit of using the air as a sewer had become deeply ingrained. Further, public toleration of this pollution was promoted by the widespread attitude that smoking industrial chimneys meant jobs and prosperity. And the public itself added to pollution by wanton practices in home heating and trash burning. Then, the development of the automobile age further increased the pollutants in the air. As a consequence of all these factors, the problem in some areas has risen to near-crisis levels.

At a recent meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association, Dr. John D. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, stated that "we are closer to putting a man on the moon than we are to creating a thoroughly healthy and pleasant environment on this earth for man to live in—closer in know-how, closer in time, closer in probability of achievement."

WHY WORRY ABOUT AIR POLLUTION?

The purity of the air we breathe is, first of all, a public health problem. Polluted air, under some extreme circumstances, can kill; it has snuffed out lives in Donora, Pa.; London, England; and the Meuse Valley of Belgium. It also can cause severe, acute illnesses simultaneously to hundreds or even thousands of people residing in a polluted area. At a somewhat lower level, air pollution can aggravate the symptoms—and perhaps shorten the lives—of patients suffering from a variety of chronic illnesses, such as heart disease, asthma, and emphysema. Rasping coughs, smarting eyes, vague feelings of nausea, and irritable tempers are among the lesser symptoms most frequently reported. And evidence also is accumulating that some pollutants found in the air of our large cities can increase the lung cancer rate among those continuously exposed to them, cigarette smokers and nonsmokers alike. Thus pure air—like pure food, milk, and water—is a requirement for good health.

Next, air pollution is an economic problem. Sometimes it causes sudden, dramatic loss—as when a puff of hydrogen-sulfide-laden gas from an industrial smokestack in one city blackens the white lead paint on a group of houses miles away, or when an acid in the air ruins the nylon stockings on the legs of women throughout an urban neighborhood, or pockmarks the paint on hundreds of parked cars. In rural regions, crops may be killed or stunted over areas of many square miles, or the crops may flourish but the animals which eat them may die. Near some cities, the airports must close down on very smoggy days, and highway traffic slows down to a crawl.

Less dramatic are the day-to-day economic effects in many hundreds of cities and towns. We must wash our clothes oftener, spend more for drycleaning them, paper our walls and paint our houses more frequently, keep our electric lights burning longer in the morning and turn them on earlier in the afternoon. Estimates of such costs range from about $10 to $100 per person per year. Also, where air pollution is a problem, real estate declines in value, and homes may prove unsalable or salable only at a sacrifice.

Of growing importance, as our standard of living rises in other respects, is the unpleasantness, or the esthetic cost, of air pollution—not to mention the obnoxious odors that accompany much air pollution. Cleanliness is a condition which most civilized human beings value for its own sake. To achieve it, we scrub and scour and polish. We pride ourselves on our sparkling glassware, shining silver, spotless linen. We fight dirt with brooms, mops, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, soaps, detergents, floor waxes, furniture polishes, and other products; and we prefer brand A to brand B if it offers the slightest hope of getting things just a little bit cleaner. Yet, our most strenuous efforts are defeated when air-borne grime descends on us.

WHAT'S IN THE AIR?

The quality of the air inside factories, mills and miscellaneous plants is most often policed, in theory at least, by State industrial health officials, because employees who would spend 40 hours a week in such air may be subjected to severe health hazards. For the purposes of this report, therefore, CU has devoted its research to the type of air pollution which affects the public at large[1] rather than specific employees. Such pollution generally is less concentrated in quantity, but its effects may be even more serious; for the very old and the very young, the sick along with the well, may be exposed to it 168 hours a week rather than 40.

The pollutants which affect the general public can be classified in several ways. Familiar terms come readily to mind: smoke, soot, dust, fly ash, fumes, gases, stench. Odors, dust, and smoke make their presence immediately known to your senses. Some chemical pollutants, in contrast, may be present in hazardous or damaging amounts without the slightest visible or sniffable evidence. Carbon-monoxide gas is the best-known example; it can kill without revealing its presence. Thus, the mere fact that the air around you seems to be clean and odorless does not necessarily mean that you live in an area where there is no pollution problem. Nor is the elimination of the conspicuous sources of pollution in an area likely to be a sufficient degree of control.

Classifying the various sources of pollution is one way to approach a discussion of the problem of achieving real control. Industrial and commercial sources may be broken down into two categories: (1) large-scale industrial installations, such as steel mills and other metallurgical plants, powerplants, petroleum refineries, chemical plants, and the like; a single large source of this type may pollute the air over scores of square miles; and (2) small-scale industrial and commercial installations, such as drycleaning plants, small asphalt-mixing plants, junkyards, etc.; added together, such sources provide a significant portion of a city's pollutants. (In some areas, large agricultural and lumbering operations, i.e., burning trash and underbrush, also may add sizable quantities of pollutants.) Municipal sources fall into three groups: (1) incinerators, burning dumps, sewage plants, etc.; (2) heating plants in schools and other municipal buildings; (3) roadbuilding and road maintenance work, and the existence of unpaved and uncleaned roads and streets. Household sources are three in number: (1) home-heating furnaces and boilers, and kitchen incinerators; (2) backyard burning of household trash, refuse, leaves, etc.; (3) apartment-house heating equipment and incinerators. Finally, there are three transportation sources: (1) private automobiles; (2) trucks and buses, including diesels; (3) ships and locomotives.

WEATHER AND GEOGRAPHY

If all cities were located on hilltops, and if the wind always blew, air pollution might be a minor nuisance at worst. Even under normal conditions, the air has serious shortcomings as a sewer. And especially (although not exclusively) in mountain-rimmed areas like Los Angeles, and in many river valleys, when the wind is not blowing the escape of pollutants is not possible to an adequate extent. In such physical circumstances, concentrations of heavy industry, surrounded by densely populated residential districts, are likely to be the focus of an air-pollution problem. When a layer of warmer air sits over a layer of cooler air in such an area, it acts like a lid on a pot, preventing the escape of pollutants upward. This meteorological condition is known as a temperature inversion. Pollutants accumulate, sometimes day after day. The "killing smogs" which have occured on rare occasions generally arise from a multiplicity of factors operating in concert.

Such, in brief, are some of the basic factors underlying air pollution. But each community has it own individual air-pollution problem, depending on the nature of its sources of pollution, its geography, and its weather.

While thousands of communities, large and small, do curb some pollution sources on the basis of complaints about visible smoke and noticeable stenches, relatively few are taking steps to solve their air-pollution problems on a scientific basis. The most elementary step, that of attempting to monitor the air thoroughly in order to determine the types and amounts of pollutants in it, has been taken by fewer than 30 communities in the entire United States. The Air Pollution Program of the U.S. Public Health Service, created by congressional action in 1955, has been collecting data only on dust particles from cities participating in its National Air Sampling Network. But the National Network data, while providing a very useful beginning in the assessment of the national problem and a basis for further broad research are not enough to solve the problems of individual communities in the network, to say nothing of those communities which do no monitoring.

If it wishes to do anything basic about its own air pollution, a community must first of all do its own monitoring, and on a much more intensive scale than is called for by participation in the National Network. Locating and eliminating the sources of the pollutants are the next necessary steps. While this procedure may seem to be elementary and simple of accomplishment when thus baldly stated, it invariably involves complex legislative, technical, and enforcement problems. These problems are the function of local air-pollution-control agencies, which usually are set up by local legislation and maintained by local appropriations. The effectiveness of the few hundred agencies now operating varies very considerably, from practically nil to fairly good (none of the cities has been able to approach complete elimination of pollution).

A recent informal poll by CU of air-pollution-control experts elicited the consensus that Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, the Kanawha Valley of West Virginia, the Niagara area, Pennsylvania's Allegheny County, Detroit, Birmingham, Alabama, and the Ohio River Valley are the dozen worst-

[1] Radioactive fallout from nuclear explosions is not included in this discussion, though it is certainly the most widespread pollutant. It belongs in a class by itself, to be discussed separately (Consumer Reports, March 1959 and February 1960), because further radioactive pollution is beyond the power of control of any one town, city, State, or even country.

polluted areas in the United States. Of these 12, only the first 4 are among the cities which have relatively effective control programs. The conclusion to be drawn, of course, is that they would be dirtier still without their programs.

CU'S OWN TEST SURVEY

In an effort to establish the extent to which community air can be polluted and to investigate the local problems which might be involved in efforts to control air pollution, CU undertook to survey an area generally known to be relatively highly polluted but for which practically no data were available.

CU's project was focused geographically on an 80-mile stretch of the Upper Ohio River Valley, west and southwest of Pittsburgh, Pa.—a heavily industrialized region which includes the steel centers of Wheeling and Weirton, W. Va., and Steubenville, Ohio, plus 17 other towns and residential suburbs lining both banks of the river in two States and eight counties. It is one of the sections of the Nation whose air is most highly contaminated with the relatively old-fashioned smoke-type of pollution for which control methods long have been known; yet, practically nothing was being done about it.

The scope of the survey was defined with the cooperation of various public health authorities, who pointed out that CU could make a significant contribution to the furtherance of air-pollution control by documenting the extreme degree of pollution which exists in an area of this sort.

Though limited geographically to this one valley, CU's survey provides a series of fresh insights into many of the basic air-pollution-control problems (technical, political, and economic) faced by residents of the many thousands of cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States.

THE VALLEY THAT MAN BESMIRCHED

The first explorers who followed the Ohio River westward and southward from what is now Pittsburgh must have found that valley one of nature's loveliest creations. But before long, trading posts sprang up along the river, these grew to be towns, and in time the river became a major artery of traffic. Today, the tonnage of freight carried through the valley on the Ohio exceeds the tonnage passing through the Panama Canal.

Cheap water transportation, the proximity of the West Virginia coal fields, and other factors made the valley an attractive site for industry; steel mills were erected, and a variety of satellite industries clustered around them. Industry attracted workers; towns grew to be cities; soon the entire valley from East Liverpool in the northwest to New Martinsville in the southwest became a close-packed jumble of residential and industrial sites. Congestion was intensified by the fact that the valley is bounded by steep hills; everything had to be crowded onto a narrow strip.

On ordinary days the air is dark with smoke along much of the valley; on days when the wind falls off and a temperature inversion occurs, conditions approach the intolerable. In 1958, the mayor of Wheeling, near the center of the valley strip, described conditions in these terms:

"* * * Wheeling * * * [has been] * * * one of the communities with front-page photographs of automobiles with their headlights on at 11 a.m., endless accounts of buckets of fly ash being swept off front porches, paint damage, and so on. One of our late physicians used to say, during his war service, that he could identify his hometown buddies by the amount of soot in their lungs."

CU's tests determined the actual degree of air pollution in nine towns and cities along the length of the valley. Tests were run during the period from November 15 to December 20, 1959, at three sites on the Ohio side of the river and six cities on the West Virginia side. Meteorological data show that no major temperature inversions occurred during this period; the results, therefore, would represent more or less typical rather than extreme pollution conditions.

One set of measurements was concerned with the actual amount of "dustfall" settling to earth, calculated in tons per square mile per month. These figures are a measure of those airborne particles which are large enough and heavy enough to settle as dust. The test equipment was simply a wide-mouthed plastic bucket; the dust accumulating in the bucket during a 30-day period was weighed directly.

TESTS FOR SMALLER PARTICLES AND GASES

To test for the presence of smaller particles which do not settle out readily, CU used a standard piece of equipment known as a high-volume sampler. A vacuum cleaner-like device sucks air at a measured rate through a filter in this sampler; the thick, dense, glass-fiber filter removes practically all of these suspended particles from the air (a hood over the intake keeps out the larger "dustfall" particles). After 24 hours, the filter is removed (to be replaced by a fresh, clean one) and weighed, and the trapped particles are then calculated in terms of weight (micrograms) per unit volume (cubic meter) of air. A total of 212 of these determinations were made throughout the valley during the survey. In all, more than 90 million gallons of air passed through the filters.

The high-volume samples provide only one kind of measure of air pollution: weight. To obtain another kind of measurement of suspended particles, visual in nature, CU also made use of standard devices known as AISI (American Iron & Steel Institute) strip samplers. These samplers expose a strip of thin filter paper to a slow stream of air for 2-hour periods. Particles collected by the paper reduce the amount of light which will pass through it. The difference in light transmission measured at exposed and unexposed segments is expressed in a standard unit known as "haze coefficient" or "COHS/1,000 feet." This figure also provides a rough measure of the degree of soiling to which clothing, curtains, and the like are subjected, even when protected from dustfall—as inside a house.

Finally, occasional determinations of carbon-monoxide, sulfur-dioxide, and nitrogen-oxide gases in the air were made with various types of gas-sampling equipment. Unlike the other measurements, these determinations were made at only a few random times and places.

THE TEST RESULTS

CU's tests left no doubt whatever that air of the Upper Ohio River Valley is very severely polluted, as a few comparisons will illustrate.

Chicago's air is generally considered to be relatively dirty and its central Loop district one of its worst sections. During December 1959, dustfall measured in the Loop averaged 55 [2] tons per square mile per month; and at one test point in the Loop, the dustfall collected at the rate of 125 tons per square mile per month. Consider, then, that the dustfall measured by CU in nine towns in the Upper Ohio River Valley averaged 185 tons per square mile per month; the worst point measured was in Wheeling, where the dustfall totaled 500 tons per square mile per month; a close second was a point in Weirton, not far from the steel plant, where the figure was 565 tons.

Measurements of suspended particles collected by the high-volume samplers gave equally startling results. Data from the U.S. Public Health Service's National Air Sampling Network (an average of 141 cities) over the 2-year period of 1957 and 1958 showed an average pollution of 130 micrograms per cubic meter at urban sites. The average of the nine cities measured by CU in the Upper Ohio River Valley was 250 micrograms. The highest average for a single city in the National Network in the 1957–58 period was 225, at both East Chicago, Ind., and Phoenix, Ariz. CU found that four of the nine Ohio Valley cities tested exceeded this figure; the highest was 385 micrograms in Steubenville.

For further purposes of comparison, here are the 1957–58 National Network averages for several other large cities:

Los Angeles	215
Philadelphia	185
Pittsburgh	185
New York	180
St. Louis	175
Boston	145
Detroit	145
Atlanta	115
New Orleans	100
Washington, D.C.	100

As important as the average pollution may be, the maximum daily pollution and the level of pollution during the worst 10 percent of the time undoubtedly are even more important. Against both these yardsticks, the valley again scored shockingly high.

The highest daily reading taken by the National Air Sampling Network anywhere in the United States during the 2-year period was 980 micrograms, measured at East Chicago, Ind., in 1957. CU's tests turned up a reading at Steubenville, Ohio, of 1,240 micrograms on December 4, 1959, without assist from a temperature inversion.

During the worst 10 percent of the time, according to the National Air Sampling Network figures, urban air on the average will reach, or exceed, a level of 240 micrograms of pollutant particles per cubic meter; the comparable figure in CU's tests for the Upper Ohio River Valley as a whole was 430 micrograms. In the National Network, Charleston, W. Va., was the highest single city in this respect in 1957–58, with 440; in the Upper Ohio River Valley, Steubenville far exceeded this figure with 650 micrograms, and the very inappropriately named Bellaire, Ohio, came second with 460 micrograms.

Significant comparisons of "haze coefficients" are more difficult to find; but Pittsburgh, until the past few years, was generally reputed to be one of the smokiest cities in the country. Back in 1953, before Pittsburgh's control efforts reached their present level, the haziness in that city averaged 3 units (COHS/1,000 feet) during the first 4 months of that year; CU's measurements in the Upper Ohio River Valley averaged 4.5 units, or 50 percent higher.

Finally, a word about carbon monoxide. CU's sporadic carbon-monoxide determinations at seven valley sites in the absence of inversion indicate that a carbon-monoxide problem unquestionably exists in the area. The extreme measurement recorded in the course of CU's tests was 50 parts carbon monoxide per million parts of air at Weirton; 40 parts per million were recorded on one occasion at Steubenville and Moundsville, and 20 parts per million at Wellsburg and Martins Ferry. These levels are not dangerous for short-time exposure in otherwise clean air. The usual factory safety standards specify a maximum indoor carbon-monoxide concentration of 100 parts per million for no more than 8 hours per day (though under some conditions even this much is considered too high). But levels of from 20 to 50 parts, sporadically recorded at open-air sites, hardly are a foundation for confidence that a problem does not exist where the populace is exposed to these or higher concentrations for long periods of time. Indeed, while CU's survey still was in the

[2] The figures in this general discussion have been rounded off.

planning stage, there was an "episode" in Weirton, in which 15 persons were hospitalized as the result of inhaling carbon-monoxide gas from the nearby steel plant. The gas was concentrated more than usual due to a temperature inversion.

POLLUTION CAN BE CONTROLLED

If no methods could be devised for reducing the flow of pollutants from industrial plants and from other sources, residents of the Upper Ohio River Valley might have to put up with it indefinitely. But most of the pollution is unnecessary. Scientists and engineers have developed techniques for reducing to an acceptable level the type of pollution through which the valley's residents still must cough and blink their way. The problem by now is not so much scientific as it is sociological and legal: to persuade or force polluters to take the steps required for cleaning up the air.

The valley's great steel plants, for example, are by common consent among the worst individual sources of pollution. Yet, even steel plants can be made moderately clean, at a price. Here, in technical language, is an account by Max D. Howell, vice president of American Iron & Steel Institute, of what such plants can accomplish:

"Blast furnaces produce about 150,000 cubic feet of gas per ton of iron. Many protective devices have been added to blast furnaces in recent years, and in many cases the cleaned, burned gases emit less than 10 pounds of dust per ton to the atmosphere, well within any normal limits of cleanliness. * * *

"The dust-catching equipment on blast furnaces is quite varied and almost all types are employed, running from venturi and orifice scrubbers through tower washers to electrostatic precipitators. It is all costly. One of our companies equipped four blast furnaces with electrostatic precipitators at a cost of $3 million, then added a gas bleeder at a cost of $200,000. * * *

"On many [open hearth] furnaces automatic combustion controls have been installed to control the fuel-to-air ratio, which results in more complete combustion and consequently less effluent.

"One company has equipped nine open hearth furnaces with electrostatic precipitators since 1954 at a cost of $5,500,000. * * *"

All but a minor fraction of the steel industry's air-pollution problems have been solved at the technical level, and practical control installations have been made at many plants in the United States and in Europe. Merely by applying the techniques already developed, great improvement can be achieved. The same is true of coal-burning powerplants—another major cause of pollution in the Upper Ohio River Valley and elsewhere.

Where, then, is the problem as it confronts not only the Upper Ohio River Valley but other pollution-plagued regions as well? Theodore B. Merrill, an editor of Business Week, had this to say in the course of a symposium on the economic and social effects of air pollution:

"* * * Nobody is going to put in any kind of control devices that cost him money unless he has to. * * * There must be sanctions against industry or else it is going to pollute the air. These sanctions can be of many types. It simply has to be unprofitable for an industry to pollute the air or else they are going to pollute it, because it is cheaper to use the air for a sewer than to pay for keeping it clean."

WHEELING TRIES TO CLEAN UP

The first city in the Upper Ohio River Valley to decide to do something about air pollution was Wheeling. In 1955 it enacted a new air-pollution-control ordinance. More important, it employed a qualified air-pollution-control expert, James Martin, and it supplied him with a staff and funds. For 5 years now, Mr. Martin and his assistant have been patrolling the air of Wheeling, using a combination of education, persuasion, and legal action.

Former Mayor Jack R. Adams of Wheeling has explained how the ordinance works:

"The Wheeling ordinance established periods of grace: 1 year for commercial and industrial buildings, railroad locomotives, and multiple-family dwelling units; 3 years for boats and tugs; 5 years for one- and two-family dwelling units. Even before the 1-year period had expired, most industries had an acceptable improvement program underway.

"* * * Every commercial, industrial, and apartment building has been inspected by the control department and has either completely corrected its air-pollution problems or will have it corrected within a reasonable time. * * * We did have a very few reluctant industrialists at first, but the air-pollution-control department has had only four prosecutions—all convictions—since the passage of the ordinance."

As sometimes is the case, the city of Wheeling itself turned out to be among the offenders contributing to pollution. More than 30 defective furnaces and boilers were spotted emitting smoke from public buildings. These sources now have been either repaired or replaced. Wheeling also polluted its own air by collecting the city's trash and burning it on a dump a few miles north of the city limits. Various plans by which this trash would be disposed of smokelessly still are being explored: a smokeless incinerator, sanitary landfill, or burning it in steam- or electricity-producing equipment are all possibilities.

The Wheeling control program already has had a beneficent effect. Drivers need no longer keep their car headlights on at 11 o'clock in the morning. But as CU's tests showed, Wheeling's air still is shockingly dirty. Wheeling's air-pollution-control engineer explains why:

"The sources of our present pollution are not ours any longer, but the whole valley's. So long as steel plants, powerplants, and many other private and public sources of pollution in neighboring communities all along the valley continue to emit pollutants by the hundreds of tons daily, nothing we can do within the city limits of Wheeling will really clean up the air."

CU's air-pollution measurements confirm this point of view. One place where CU made measurements, for example, was New Cumberland, W. Va. A residential town of 2,000 population, New Cumberland does almost nothing within its own city limits to pollute the air. The strictest town ordinance, enforced with the utmost severity, would accomplish very little. Yet, the air over New Cumberland showed more than average pollution in dustfall, suspended matter, and haze coefficient alike, even when compared with the other heavily polluted towns of the valley. The reason: fly ash pours in from an electric power-generating plant on the Ohio side of the river; other pollutants drift in from upstream when the wind blows down the river, as it usually does, and from downstream when the wind reverses its direction.

One further example serves to underline the regional nature of the problem: the city of Moundsville on the West Virginia side of the river. There is a power-generating station on the Ohio side of the river whose stacks pour many tons of fly ash daily across the State line into Moundsville. Moundsville itself is the site of a penitentiary, where the inmates mine thousands of tons of coal annually and burn it inefficiently in the penitentiary boilers, so that smoke comes billowing out of its stacks. Also, some of the city's trash is burned on a refuse dump. The net result is an impasse. It is hard to sell pollution control in Moundsville so long as the powerplant across the river befouls the air, and the plant across the river hardly can be expected to clean up while Moundsville does nothing.

The problems in Weirton and Steubenville, sites of large steel plants, are different. Weirton is a one-industry town, officially incorporated in 1949. Says one observer:

"The steel plant is located in the valley and the pollution can readily be seen for many miles. The plant evidently has little or no pollution control, and the town is constantly covered with grime and smoke. Little, if any, improvement can be expected without legal action. The city government officials, as well as most of the citizens, depend upon the steel plant for their livelihood. There is a general fear that if pollution control were enforced, the plant might relocate elsewhere."

Summary of CU's air pollution data

	Dustfall [1]	Suspended matter [2]			COHS/1,000 feet [3]	Some constituents of suspended matter [2]		
		Minimum	Maximum	Average		Lead	Iron	Sulfate
Upper Ohio River Valley, November–December 1959:								
Bellaire, Ohio	35	76	485	300	----	----	----	----
Martins Ferry, Ohio	15	60	378	178	----	0.7	4.4	2.7
Moundsville, W. Va.	85	57	398	203	----	----	----	----
New Cumberland, W. Va.	178	72	554	263	4.7	----	----	----
New Martinsville, W. Va.	18	43	336	157	----	----	----	----
Steubenville, Ohio	123	119	1,238	383	5.3	1.4	30.8	4.7
Weirton, W. Va.	566	62	316	186	5.5	----	----	----
Wellsburg, W. Va.	37	61	462	209	3.5	----	----	----
Wheeling, W. Va.	588	72	522	260	3.5	----	----	----
Average	183	----	----	248	4.4	----	----	----
National Air Sampling Network, 1957 and 1958: Average of 141 cities	----	11	978	131	----	----	----	----

[1] Tons per square mile per month. [2] Micrograms per cubic meter; average per day. [3] Or haze coefficient (see story).

Even Steubenville, not so completely dependent on its steel plants as Weirton is, has taken no action to control its own major industry. And the entire valley suffers.

In CU's opinion, the fear that industry will move away if pollution controls are enforced is not well-grounded. Such threats frequently are made; but air-pollution-control authorities consulted by CU could recall not a single instance in which a major industry actually pulled up stakes merely because it was required to stop using the air as a sewer. If an industry is in a good competitive situation at its present location, it apparently will stay.

In some cases, it may be better for the company in the long run to replace old, hard-to-control equipment with new, more efficient equipment with built-in air-pollution controls. For example, open-hearth furnaces can be replaced with new oxygen-process steelmaking equipment, which will

improve a company's competitive situation and allow for relatively economical air-pollution control. Control equipment, moreover, often pays out in part at least through greater efficiency in the use of fuel and through a recovery of salable byproducts. In a number of well-documented instances, industries which have fought against controls until forced to clean up by court action have ultimately installed control equipment—and actually reaped a profit from the installation.

NEEDED: A REGIONAL APPROACH

Very soon after the initiation of the Wheeling air-pollution-control program, it became evident that regional action was necessary. The eight counties stretched along the valley were as powerless as the 20 municipalities, and neither of the two States (Ohio and West Virginia) concerned could solve the problem by itself. What was needed, obviously, was a regionwide air-pollution-control program to treat the entire valley as a single air-pollution unit.

As a first step in this direction, the Ohio Valley Air Pollution Control Council, Inc., was formed officially in 1958; it is a voluntary agency which now has 120 dues-paying industry, association, and individual members, and the participation of five city governments.

After much study, the council has sponsored a new law in the West Virginia Legislature which would empower local governments to control their own pollution and to participate in regional action. Passage is hoped for at the 1961 legislative session. Ohio already has enabling legislation authorizing each city to control local pollution, but none as yet for regional control.

Another activity of the council has been to press for studies of just how much pollution there is. CU's survey has documented the urgent need for a valley-wide control program, including a more thorough study of the pollutants and their sources. In such cases, the assistance of the U.S. Public Health Service can be extremely helpful. The Public Health Service carries out three types of air-pollution activity: research, the training of personnel, and technical assistance to States and local governments which formally request such assistance. (Note well: the Public Health Service cannot step into an air-pollution situation until it is requested to do so by local authorities.)

After several years of unsuccessful effort to get together, the four groups concerned (the two States, the council, and the Public Health Service) agreed to embark cooperatively on a survey of pollution conditions in the valley; it can be judged significant that this agreement occurred about 2 weeks after CU's survey was started. CU has turned over its data (and its samples) to the Public Health Service, to facilitate the official survey.

But by far the biggest hurdles still lie ahead. Once all the surveys have been completed and preliminary plans have been laid, someone is going to have to "bell the cat." State laws or municipal ordinances with teeth in them will have to be enacted—and enforced. According to experts in the field, an effective control agency can be operated (in an area having good control legislation) for costs in the range of about 10 cents to 60 cents per person per year, depending on the severity of the local problem. Even at the higher figure, the cost would be considerably less than the lowest estimate of the cost per person of living with polluted air. It will be necessary to awaken valley citizens specifically, and the rest of the Nation in general, to the nature and intensity of the air-pollution problem, to the seriousness of the health risks being run, and to the basic fact that control measures are technically available and in all probability economically feasible.

COOPERATION: THE NEED IS INESCAPABLE

As described in the preceding article, the need for cooperation among neighboring communities which pollute each other's air is not at all confined to the Ohio River Valley. It has to be emphasized, however, that the form of cooperation must be suited to local conditions. Some examples illustrate the differences:

In many situations, a county air-pollution program (legislation and enforcement at the county level) will solve the problem. Such county programs are in existence, for example, in Allegheny County, Pa.; Polk County, Fla.; Jefferson County, Ky.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

A multicounty program (State legislation authorizing cooperation among counties, with a single enforcement agency for the entire area) sometimes is necessary. An outstanding example of such a program is the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District in the San Francisco area, which includes the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara.

A two-State agency is necessary in some areas. Examples, in addition to the Ohio River Valley, include New York and New Jersey, in the New York City area; Illinois and Indiana, in the Chicago-Gary area; Ohio and Kentucky, in the Cincinnati area; and Illinois and Missouri, in the St. Louis area.

Some situations require the establishment of a special international agency to effect cooperation between two countries. Examples would be the Detroit-Windsor, the Niagara Falls, and El Paso-Juarez areas.

The rate at which metropolitan complexes are growing makes such forms of cooperation increasingly inescapable.

RAINBOW BRIDGE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to elevate the present Rainbow Bridge National Monument to national park status. The bill is intended to embrace the proposals made recently by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to solve a troublesome problem surrounding the Rainbow Bridge National Monument as a result of construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, which would sometimes back water into the monument area.

When the Glen Canyon Dam was authorized as a major unit of the upper Colorado River storage project, a provision was inserted into the bill stating "that as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument." In another clause, Congress stated its intention "That no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this chapter shall be within any national park or monument." The efforts by the Department of the Interior to comply with the language of the Upper Colorado Act occasioned great controversy. The Department recommended the erection of barrier dams and water pumping units to keep water out of the monument. These dams, with appurtenant works, would not only have desecrated a great wilderness area, but they would have also constituted a colossal waste of the taxpayers' money, at a cost of $25 million or more.

I wish to commend Secretary Udall for his statesmanship and leadership in reaching a solution to the Rainbow Bridge problem, and I ask unanimous consent that the related portion of his press conference held on February 7 of this year be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Secretary Udall proposes that Rainbow Bridge National Monument be given national park status and thereafter probably preserved in a wilderness state. It would also be expanded if negotiations with the Navajo Indian Tribe, which owns the adjacent lands, are successful. A survey will soon be made by the National Park Service, looking into the possibility of expansion. These negotiations could conceivably take years. Because of this possible delay, I felt it best to get national park status, and then the boundaries can be expanded later.

In addition, Secretary Udall proposes that water should be permitted to back up into the monument area, feeling that this is preferable to desecrating the great wilderness area surrounding Rainbow Bridge with dams and pumps and with roads necessary to construction of the dams. This will require amendment of the Upper Colorado Act, and my bill embodies such amendments.

My bill would make the existing 160-acre natural bridge national monument a national park. I will be quite willing to accept any carefully considered program for expansion of the proposed park after the Department of the Interior has completed its negotiations and studies. In the Secretary's transcript for February 7, he states that the Department is considering a land exchange with the Navajo Indians. Since Utah was just called upon to relinquish 53,000 acres to the Navajos in a similar trade involving Glen Canyon reservoir lands, I assume that further acreage will come from other States, unless an acreage transfer in Utah has the full support of the Utah State government and of the local people and interests affected.

Rainbow Bridge National Monument and the surrounding area is fully deserving of national park status. The bridge itself is greater in size than any other known natural bridge. Its 278-foot span gracefully arches to a height of 309 feet, large enough to straddle the Capitol in Washington, D.C. It is 42 feet thick at the top and is 33 feet wide, sufficient to accommodate the average highway.

My amendments to the upper Colorado Act provide that the Secretary of the Interior must take necessary steps to prevent structural impairment to the Rainbow Bridge itself. In addition, where the Upper Colorado Act states that no dam or reservoir shall be constructed within a national park or monument, I have eliminated the words, "or reservoir." The only national park or monument into which water would be backed under the upper Colorado project is Rainbow. Therefore, the elimination of the words, "or reservoir," will affect only that area.

Let me emphasize that the Rainbow Bridge itself will not be structurally damaged by the Glen Canyon Reservoir. I have carefully read the geologic examination of the bridge made for the Department of the Interior by Wallace R.

Hansen. He concludes that "there appears to be no valid geologic reason to fear structural damage to Rainbow Bridge as a result of possible repeated incursions and withdrawals of reservoir waters to and from the inner gorge of Bridge Creek beneath the bridge."

According to the Bureau of Reclamation report, the water under the bridge would be only 46 feet deep, but the water surface would be 21 feet below the left abutment and 33 feet below the right abutment of the bridge. And this depth would only occur 13 percent of the time when the reservoir is at its highest level. In other words, as geologist Hansen further states:

> It thus is clear that any possible impairment to the bridge from fluctuating standing water beneath it would be esthetic rather than geologic or structural.

The so-called protective program calls for a barrier dam a half mile below the monument. While this dam would stop water from backing under the bridge, it would also trap normal drainage from springs and from flash floods occurring *inside* the monument. Thus, automatic pumps would have to be installed at the damsite to lift the water over the dam. Then to get the material to the dam, it would be necessary to airlift men and equipment to the top of a 1,200-foot mesa above the construction site and lower aggregate by cableways and helicopters. The cost would be unbelievably high.

In addition, the plan calls for a dam and diversion tunnel three-fifths of a mile above the bridge to divert around the monument the creek which flows intermittently beneath the arch. It would also divert flash floods with their sediment and debris.

To protect a natural bridge which will not be harmed, Congress is asked to appropriate $25 million or more. The fiscal year 1962 budget proposes a $10 million expenditure this year alone. This is a high price to pay for no protection. Moreover, the 183-foot high dam would gouge a canyon wilderness area. And as the Salt Lake Tribune stated in its editorial of March 8, 1960:

> To get material (for the dam) would entail excavation atop a high mesa in a fantastically eroded area. Thus, not only would physical aspects of a wilderness be altered, but noise and fumes from diesels located outside the monument would certainly be apparent inside—hardly in keeping with the wilderness concept.

As for any esthetic problem created by the fluctuating water level of the reservoir, it should be noted that existing floods and seepage are at least as troublesome and probably worse in their effect.

An additional effect of the barrier dam would be to make the monument even more inaccessible. Rainbow Bridge can only be reached now by mule pack over a 15-mile trail from the Navajo Mountain School near the Utah-Arizona border. In 1958, only 1,238 people were able to visit the bridge, and in 1959, only 1,370. More people should be permitted to see the magnificent bridge. The reservoir will enable thousands more people each year to see the bridge and canyons, a sight presently denied to all but a hardy few.

Secretary Udall is certainly well qualified to make the sound recommendations that he has offered on the Rainbow Bridge question. He was delegated by Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make an on-the-ground study. He reported to the House committee on August 27, 1960, and I think his recommendations should be adopted by Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his August 27 letter addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, together with an excerpt from Secretary of the Interior Udall's press conference of February 7, and the text of my bill, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1188) to establish Rainbow Bridge National Monument as Rainbow Bridge National Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to establish Rainbow Bridge National Monument as Rainbow Bridge National Park, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Rainbow Bridge National Monument in the State of Utah is hereby established as the Rainbow Bridge National Park to be administered as a national park under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 2. An Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes", approved April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of the first section, by striking out "impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument" and inserting in lieu thereof "structural impairment of the Rainbow Bridge in Rainbow Bridge National Park"; and

(2) in the last sentence of section 3, by striking out "or reservoir".

The letter and excerpt presented by Mr. BENNETT are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1960.

Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: This letter will constitute my report to you and to our committee on my inspection trip, in conjunction with Representative JOHN SAYLOR, of the Powell Lake Reservoir site above Glen Canyon Dam and the problems created by the waters of this lake at Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Traveling by motorboat I entered the Glen Canyon Reservoir site area at Hite, Utah. Proceeding downstream, we arrived at the mouth of Forbidden Canyon—the entrance canyon to Rainbow Bridge National Monument—the evening of August 8. On August 9 we hiked 6 miles upstream through Forbidden and Bridge Canyons to Rainbow Bridge, and I spent more than 3 hours in the immediate vicinity of the bridge itself. I climbed atop the bridge to visually survey the surrounding area, and also hiked up Bridge Canyon nearly 1 mile to get some idea of the terrain and of the watercourse. On my arrival in Page on August 9, I held a conference with the project engineer, Mr. L. M. Wylie, and elicited from him additional facts which I will recite below.

Rainbow Bridge, located in a deep canyon of red sandstone with 10,000-foot Navajo Mountain as a backdrop, is unquestionably the most awe-inspiring work of natural sculpture anywhere in the United States. The national monument—an arbitrary 160-acre plot—is located in an area so wild and inaccessible that less than 12,000 persons have visited Rainbow Bridge since it was discovered in 1909. For many miles the area which surounds the bridge is a series of deep canyons and towering sandstone monuments which have a rugged beauty comparable only to that of the Grand Canyon itself.

The problem at Rainbow which confronts the Congress is a delicate one which raises profound conservation policy questions. The problem is rooted in the fact that it is anticipated that the Glen Canyon Reservoir will be full about 10 percent of the time. At high water the reservoir will cross the boundary of the National Monument and, confined within the narrow watercourse of Bridge Canyon, pass under the bridge (without contacting or endangering its abutments) and reach nearly to the south boundary of the monument.

When Congress passed the Colorado Storage and Development Project Act in 1956—to allay opposition from conservation groups who objected strongly to lake water intruding into the monument—we included the following language in the bill:

"Provided further, that as part of the Glen Canyon unit, the Secretary of Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument."

In 1956 the problem had not been clearly defined. There were those who felt that the lake waters might undermine the very foundation of the bridge, and there was also considerable uncertainty concerning the location and feasibility of proposed protective barrier dams. Fortunately, geologic studies have now confirmed the fact that the lake does not present a threat to the abutments of the bridge, but the entry of waters into the monument remains a serious policy question.

Appropriate studies have now been made and Congress must soon reach a decision concerning what protective structures, if any, should be erected to preclude the impairment of the monument.

As I see it, the choice of the Congress is limited to three alternatives. They are:

1. A two-dam plan which would consist of: (a) A downstream barrier dam outside the boundaries of the monument to prevent the encroachment of lake water into the monument itself; and (b) an upstream dam—again outside the boundaries of the monument—to catch the downstream runoff in Bridge Canyon and divert it into the lake through a 1-mile tunnel into Forbidden Canyon.

NOTE.—According to information furnished me by Mr. Wylie both dams would be constructed of earth—the lower dam to a height of approximately 180 feet, the upper nearly 50 feet. He also contemplates that some kind of pumping plant would be necessary at the lower dam to expel waters which would accumulate in the monument from spring flows, etc., below the diversion dam. Wylie also stated that the material for the two dam would come from the nearby area, as presumaby any contractor

would attempt to hold down his costs by making his earth hauls as short as possible. It seems inevitable to me that any plan would entail extensive alterations of the landscape with the usual network of roads and trails, earthmoving, and general "face-lifting" over the whole immediate area. Of course, a construction headquarters would also be located near the dam, and it is safe to assume also that during the construction period the surrounding terrain would suffer disfigurement. Wylie also stated that one of the main items of the contract would be the construction of access roads to the site. He assumes that any road would originate from the Rainbow Lodge area on the south side of Navajo Mountain, and that the contractor would select the route cheapest to construct. The terrain of the approaches is extremely rough (so much so that the road system might well cost more than the dams), and it is plain that thrusting a road into the wild canyons which surround the monument would change the primitive area status of Rainbow.

2. The second alternative, favored—at least, as a minimum program—by Representative SAYLOR in his report (and, I might add, by some of the Bureau of Reclamation engineers at Page) would limit the protective measures to the construction of the upstream diversion dam and tunnel. Advocates of this plan believe that unless this dam is built large quantities of silt and rubble will be washed down Bridge Canyon during flash floods and accumulate within the National Monument.

3. The third alternative is to do nothing—to suffer the intrusion of the lake as the lesser of evils.

After the most careful study and after extensive discussion with the conservationists who know this extraordinary National Monument best, I have come to the firm conclusion that the last alternative would best serve the longrun interests of this park, and of the conservation movement itself.

Although the lake water offends a basic principle of park conservation, it is my conviction that the construction of any manmade works within 5 miles of the present monument boundaries would do far greater violence to the first commandment of conservation—that the great works of nature should remain in their virginal state wherever possible. The natural setting of Rainbow embraces a much larger area than the boxlike artificial monument; and it is a gross mistake to detach the arch itself from its environment.

As I conceive it, from my study of the history of conservation in America, the one overriding principle of the conservation movement is that no works of man (save the bare minimum of roads, trails, and necessary public facilities in access areas) should intrude into the wonder places of the national park system. A corollary of this principle is that even the waters of a manmade lake or reservoir constitute an unwarranted park invasion. Therefore, as I see it, building either of the two proposed dams near the artificial boundaries of the monument would sacrifice the cardinal principle in order to save its corollary.

There is a magnificent overlook from the top of Rainbow Bridge, and just to the west of the bridge itself, within the monument, there is a great sandstone cliff which would be climbable with the assistance of one or two fixed ropes. In time, many hardy visitors to the monument will climb to both overlooks and view the surrounding sandstone canyons and formations which enhance the grandeur and seclusion of Rainbow—and, indeed, merit inclusion in the national park system.

Rainbow is not a park for sedentary America. Although it was discovered more than 50 years ago, its exclusive roll of visitors still numbers less than 12,000. In the long run it will be conserved only if it remains secluded in this fantastic area of canyons and cliffs—a prize to be really won only by hardy Americans willing to undertake a long hike or horseback trip from its land-approach side.

I should note also that in making my decision I have given no weight whatsoever to the argument that the two-dam plan is too costly—an argument which has been erroneously advanced by some opponents of the protective works. We in the Congress gave our pledge to provide protection, and if sound principles of conservation dictate the erection of dams, cost should not be a factor in the decisionmaking process.

In addition to the reasons set forth above, I reject the second alternate—the upstream diversion dam and tunnel—for other special reasons. One argument advanced to justify the diversion dam and tunnel is that seasonal flash floods on the small Bridge Canyon watershed will pour tremendous quantities of silt and rubble into the streambed and create an unsightly clutter in the vicinity of the bridge itself. I do not believe the facts uphold this conclusion. The stream channel of Bridge Canyon is a very narrow one. I walked nearly 1 mile upstream from Rainbow, and the stream bed is held in solid rock walls and varies in width from 7 to 25 feet. Despite the presence of many large boulders in the streambed, I found its channel remarkably free of debris throughout, and there is no evidence of mountain silt at any point along the channel. The gradient of this creek is abrupt, and any large thunderstorm on the watershed inevitably produces runoff that moves with great velocity through the channel. Men familiar with the area over a period of many years relate that periodically flash floods occur and these narrow canyons are scoured clean. In other words, all available evidence indicates that fears of a silt-debris pileup within the monument are unfounded.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of my study I make two major recommendations to my colleagues:

The first is that Congress resolve this issue by a conscious choice, and not create ill will by a default decision through the expedient of refusing to appropriate funds for the measures promised in the act of 1956. If a majority of our colleagues feel protective works should be constructed, the earlier promise should be kept and necessary funds should be appropriated.

On the other hand, if the conclusion I have come to is the right one I believe Congress should clear itself of any imputation of bad faith by passing an appropriate resolution spelling out, in terms of sound conservation principles, the reasons why protective steps were not taken. If this course is followed, I would also urge that strenuous efforts be made to persuade the conservation spokesmen of this country to make a further study of this problem in the hope they might concur in this action.

My second recommendation is that a new protective measure be taken which will truly conserve Rainbow. I favor a broad extension of boundaries so that Rainbow Bridge National Monument will include its natural backdrop, the sandstone canyon area between the high water mark of Powell Lake and Navajo Mountain. Such action would safeguard this remarkable natural wonder and insure its preservation for all time as a primitive park area. Such boundary enlargement should include two other striking natural bridges to the east and the large white-domed throne at the foot of Navajo Mountain which dominates the entire area.

Of course, all of the lands in this proposed enlargement area are owned by the Navajo Tribe, and unless agreement could be reached with the tribe the present boundaries could not be changed. However, this area of wild scenic beauty is almost uninhabitable and is unproductive for grazing or related purposes. It is entirely possible the tribe would give serious consideration to such a proposal if productive Federal lands were offered as part of a land exchange.

This, Mr. Chairman, is my report, and I will merely close by stating that my trip to Rainbow was one of the most exciting outdoor adventures I have ever experienced.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

EXCERPTS FROM SECRETARY UDALL'S PRESS CONFERENCE OF FEBRUARY 7, 1961

The one major announcement that I had to make this morning concerns the Rainbow Bridge controversy that most of you are familiar with. We have what we think and hope is a creative compromise solution to this problem.

I made overtures some time ago to the Navajo Indian Tribe, as those of you know who are familiar with this area, and few people are because it is so remote and rugged. You talk about wilderness; this is a real wilderness. There are parts of it that no man, red or white, or of any other color, has been in, I suppose.

But the proposed compromise is that, rather than attempting to persuade Congress, which appears to me to be a losing proposition, to try and get money to build barrier dams and to shove a highway back into this wilderness area, we would try to carve out a much larger area which might very well emerge as of national park caliber.

I have seen this area. There are deep, rugged, sandstone canyons, and as a matter of fact, Rainbow Bridge itself, for sheer grandeur, I think, has nothing comparable to it in terms of natural sculpture in the whole national park system.

Our thought is that if the Navajo Indians are willing, we would carve out a much larger area, the surrounding area, the natural amphitheater in which Rainbow Bridge sits, and would either enlarge the national monument or perhaps ask Congress, if we think it merits it, to declare it or make it a national park.

Connie Worth is preparing now—and we have held a meeting on this—a reconnaissance task force that will go out. The Navajo Indians will be represented on the task force, and they are going to do some aerial mapping and some exploring, and I use that word in its literal sense, and make an initial recommendation concerning proposed boundaries.

I am going to plead with my friends who are so concerned about the protection of the national parks to consider this very seriously as a sound solution to this impasse that we are in. But this would ultimately result in the Navajo Indians letting us have what land we need for the new national park, in a land exchange, and they would take other lands which would be determined subsequently in return.

In other words, we would swap land with them, and we would take this national park land, and they would presumably get other lands of equal value.

So this is underway. I think the reconnaissance group will go out soon, and ultimately I am hoping that many of the people who have expressed such great concern over this problem and have been so deeply involved in it, that we can ask them to participate in the actual selection of the land to go into the new national monument or national park.

What we may emerge doing, then, is having, out of controversy, come a new idea which may be a happy solution for all concerned.

Those are the only matters that I had to present to you this morning, and beyond that we will just "have at it," so go ahead.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, how large is this area that you contemplate for the park?

Secretary UDALL. I do not know. This is one of the things that the reconnaissance group will do, to determine what area should properly go in. I think this area, in my view, is more scenic and more beautiful and more striking than, for instance, Bryce Canyon National Park in southern Utah, which is a very fine one, and I do not depreciate it, and several other national parks that I could name.

But it might be an area 10 or 15 square miles. As you know, the present national monument is a little box, and how they ever did that in 1910—they simply took a 160-acre box and put it down over this bridge itself. Well, there are two other natural bridges in the area that we hope to bring in, and there are a series of deep, rugged, sandstone canyons that are very inaccessible and have very great beauty.

In 50 years there have only been 12,000 rugged souls who have ever managed to get in to Rainbow Bridge, and personally, as far as I am concerned, I would like to keep it a remote area, prized by people who are willing to hike or ride a horse for 2 days, and I think it would be almost unique in a way as one of our national parks that is very remote and difficult to get to.

Now, this would mean, of course, that instead of spending $20 million or $25 million or $30 million, or whatever was necessary to violate this wilderness, and to build protective dams of some kind, we would in time, we hope, get Congress to spend money on some kind of development of at least access to the outskirts of the park, so that it would become a better known place in the park system.

The PRESS. Is this a preliminary to deciding the filling criteria for Grand Canyon?

Secretary UDALL. No; it is not related in any way. The filling criteria is another separate problem that we are continuing to work on.

The PRESS. Where would the land in the exchange take place? Would it be in Utah, or Arizona, or both?

Secretary UDALL. I have no way of knowing, because the procedure will be for us to decide first what lands we would like to have, to get the Navajo Tribe to agree to let us have these lands, and then we would negotiate with them.

You see, we have precedent for this. At the townsite at Page, for this dam, the land exchange took place and the Navajo Tribe has been through this type of land swap and they apparently like the way it was done last time, so they then would decide.

I have an inkling, which is not worth discussing here today, of what they are interested in, but I do not know what State it would be in, or what type of land. It would be up to them.

The PRESS. They wanted some of the land back that they gave away in the last exchange, so that they could work up their own park system.

I have another question: What do the conservationists think about it?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I have talked with some of them, and I find that their attitude is constructive. I hope that this will be true all along the line. We intend to bring them into the discussions and I hope to get some of them out there and let them help us pick the land to go in the park. I am hoping that we can put this together.

Incidentally, even to build these barrier dams or to do any of this work that is contemplated, it would have to be done on the Navajo Indian Reservation. We do not push the Indians around any more like we used to. We require their concurrence.

With some of the Indians, at least, this is regarded as one of their sacred areas, and no one knows really whether they would let the Government move in and do all of this work and violate it. So we have to work with the Indians. This is part of the problem, too.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, basically, this is in line with your report to Chairman ASPINALL last August.

Secretary UDALL. That is right. The details may vary, but this is essentially the type of solution that I came up with last August, when I went in and looked at the area.

The PRESS. Was there any printed reaction in conservation journals and publications at that time, that you recall?

Secretary UDALL. Nothing that was negative. I was quite pleased with its reception, and, in fact, I think most of the people who will go in and look at the area, who would hike in, would agree that this is the best solution from the standpoint of conservation and the park system.

OCEANOGRAPHY RESEARCH BY THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct oceanographic research, either independently or in cooperation with other Government agencies.

The U.S. Coast Guard has a historic background dating back to 1790, or, to put it another way, from almost the very beginning of our constitutional Government.

All of us can be proud of its magnificent record in protecting American life and property on the high seas, providing aids to commerce and navigation, and, from points far distant from our mainland, supplying advance weather information.

The Coast Guard has a splendid officer corps and a fleet of ships well designed and equipped to carry out its statutory missions. These are, in order of priority, first, search and rescue; second, air navigation and communications; and third, meteorological observations.

Aids to navigation and icebreaking activities fall within the first category.

Officers of the Coast Guard have advised me that they would welcome the addition of a fourth priority to the three above mentioned, the new priority—oceanography.

Present statutory authority, however, precludes the Coast Guard from budgeting for oceanographic research except in direct support of the ice patrol. In this limited area the Coast Guard has made notable accomplishments.

It is reasonable to assume, the Coast Guard advises me, that about one-third of all oceanographic observations from surface vessels in the Arctic and Antarctic have been conducted by these vessels. The reference here was to the Coast Guard icebreakers, which, with aircraft and other ships, are engaged in our farflung ice patrol.

The icebreaker *Northwind* several months ago made the first fall oceanographic cruise ever undertaken of the Bering, Beaufort, and Chukchi Seas. No prior observations of this type ever had been made in that season of the year.

It is a matter of considerable pride to me that the University of Washington cooperated on this unprecedented cruise which, I am informed, contributed greatly to our knowledge of these cold waters.

The work of Coast Guard icebreakers in Arctic waters is indicative of the benefits that might be gained in oceanographic research were the authority of the Coast Guard broadened to include such research in all areas of operation.

That is what the bill I have introduced today proposes to do.

The Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences fully supports the objective of this bill. In a communication to me it states, and I quote:

> The Committee on Oceanography believes that the U.S. Coast Guard should have authority and should be encouraged to conduct basic and applied oceanographic research, to install, maintain, and use standard oceanographic equipment, to collect and analyze oceanographic data, and (in cooperation with other agencies) to engage in special studies and programs in oceanography.
>
> With increased national emphasis on marine sciences the oceanographic activities of the Coast Guard must be allowed and encouraged to develop along with those of other Government agencies. The total national effort required is great. The Coast Guard can provide a vital supplement to this effort.
>
> The Coast Guard operates a series of lighthouses, lightships, and ocean stations. Each is a valuable platform for the observation, collection of data, and study of oceanographic phenomenon.
>
> The ocean stations and lightships, because they provide for the possibility of obtaining longtime series of oceanographic data from a single location, are of unique importance to the further development of oceanographic understanding.

Mr. President, as I stated on February 9, when I introduced the bill (S. 901) to authorize a national, 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys, the Coast Guard has perhaps the greatest potential of any Government agency for obtaining certain types of valuable oceanographic data in the quickest possible time at the lowest cost.

To do this, of course, the present statutory disabilities must be removed.

The Coast Guard, for example, operates 31 lightships which would, to quote a report I have from the agency, "provide a medium for marine research which is uniquely valuable."

The Coast Guard operates 55 large buoy tenders of over 150 feet in length of which 38, those in the 180-foot class, have a tremendous potential for servicing and collecting data from meteorological and oceanographic buoys. The initial oceanographic automatic buoy is now being constructed on Cobb Seamount off the Washington coast.

> It is reasonable to assume—
>
> The Coast Guard states—
>
> that since these are the only U.S. vessels capable of working buoys at sea, the future plans for increased use of oceanographic buoys systems will call upon the services of this type of vessel.

Thirty-two of the 36 large cutters of over 200 feet in length are employed at weather stations in the Atlantic and the

Pacific. These vessels, the Coast Guard states—

represent a research potential significant to even a casual observer.

Recently the Coast Guard prepared at my request a table showing the number of ships of each type the Coast Guard is operating in each of five areas—Atlantic coast, Pacific coast, Great Lakes, Hawaii-Pacific, and Alaska areas.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD, however, I should point out ships in several categories are not adapted to oceanographic research or, at best, are adapted to only very limited types of research either because of the size or type of the vessel or because of the present heavy workload in existing statutory operations.

Buoy tenders under 150 feet would not be capable of oceanographic research, the Coast Guard informs me, except within the most limited concepts. Patrol boats and harbor tugs under 110 feet are quite unsuitable for research. The miscellaneous craft have assignments not commensurate with other activities.

Icebreakers and the large cutters working with or assigned to the ice patrol are now, under the unique statutory authority stated above to conduct marine research, actively engaged in such work, but their number is small.

Enactment of the bill I am introducing today would make the Coast Guard a full-fledged member of our oceanographic team, and will, I am sure, make valuable contributions to this science at a minimum of cost.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table prepared by the Coast Guard titled "A Summary of Coast Guard Vessels and Operations."

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

The bill (S. 1189) to amend title 14 of the United States Code in order to authorize the Coast Guard to carry on certain oceanographic research, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The table presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

A summary of Coast Guard vessels and operations

Description	Atlantic coast	Pacific coast	Great Lakes	Hawaiian and Pacific areas	Alaska area	Total
Large cutters (over 200 feet)	24	8	0	4	0	[1] 36
Icebreakers	2	1	1	0	1	5
Patrol craft (100 to 200 feet)	17	6	0	0	0	23
Oceangoing tugs	4	4	0	0	0	8
Buoy tenders (over 150 feet)	30	6	7	5	7	[2] 55
Buoy tenders (under 150 feet)	33	6	17	0	2	58
Patrol boats and harbor tugs (under 110 feet)	80	33	5	1	6	125
Lightships	23	7	1	0	0	31
Miscellaneous craft	4	0	0	2	0	6
Total by area	217	71	31	12	16	347

[1] 32 of these are assigned to ocean station duties and used as weather ships.
[2] 38 of these ships, those in the 180-foot class, are particularly suitable for supplemental oceanographic research.

ESTABLISHING A SPACE AGE MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the advent of the space age has resulted in far-reaching changes in U.S. and world life, dramatic new weapons, including missiles; and ever-increasing nuclear firepower, require an extensive modernization and reorientation of defenses; discoveries in science have opened new vistas of opportunity and challenge for human life on earth and for space exploration; the technological revolution—with a great impact upon business, agricultural, industrial, and other aspects of economic progress, as well as defense, promises to drastically alter the pattern of operation in such fields.

The key to progress in these, and other fields, is manpower and—more specifically—brainpower.

To meet the needs of normal, peacetime progress, as well as defense, I am proposing the establishment of a special Manpower Commission.

The Commission would be comprised of members representing the Defense Department, National Space Agency, the scientific fields, industry, related fields, and the American taxpayer.

OBJECTIVES OF MANPOWER COMMISSION

What would be the objective? Among others, the purposes would be:

To determine the impact of the space age upon manpower requirements of the Armed Forces;

To evaluate the adequacy of existing programs—including the draft—for obtaining and training personnel of the Armed Forces to operate and service the advanced weaponry of the space age;

To determine where, and how, the lack of trained personnel impairs or lessens technological advances;

To eliminate overlapping, duplication, and unnecessary rivalry in the armed services in utilizing personnel;

To effectively staff the industrial plants that support the Armed Forces;

To enlist the scientific manpower, not only for producing and manning weapons, but also to carry on research for the even more advanced space equipment, instruments, and vehicles of the future;

To help create the reservoir of experts, technicians, planners, leaders, and others essential to balanced progress in the domestic life of the country; this could well include efforts to carry on research and development programs to find solutions to problems resulting from technological advancements—such as automation; economic dislocations—such as now face the coal and other industries; and other economic dilemmas.

During the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill, Senate Joint Resolution 188, for the establishment of a Manpower Commission. Unfortunately, the Congress failed to take action.

The ever-growing challenges at home and abroad, however, provide new evidence on the need for most effective utilization of our manpower-brainpower resources.

Unless this is done, we might find ourselves losers—not winners—in the all-out battle for survival against Communists—a block of nearly a billion people and vast resources mobilized to attain their goal of world conquest.

At this time, I request unanimous consent to have the text of a bill for creating such a Manpower Commission printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to establish a Commission on Manpower Needs for Defense in the Space Age, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Manpower Needs for Defense in the Space Age

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, intermediate range ballistic missiles, air-to-air, ground-to-air, air-to-ground, and other complex types of missile weaponry has caused extensive changes to occur in the defense requirements of the Nation. One of the most significant of these changes is the increased time which is now required to train personnel for the complex tasks which are required for defense in the space age. It may be reasonably expected that as the technology of the space age advances the need for highly trained personnel in the military services and in the civilian components of national defense will increase tremendously. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to establish a high level commission to assess the manpower requirements for defense in the space age, to formulate a program for meeting the complex training needs of defense and civilian personnel, for the effective utilization of trained personnel, and to determine ways and means for creating the reservoir of experts, technicians, planners, leaders, and others who are essential to balanced progress in the domestic economy, and to provide recommendations with respect thereto.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Manpower Needs for Defense in the Space Age, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members, as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President of the United States, from public and private life, including at least one from the Armed Forces of the United States, and one from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) Four members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and

(3) Four members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives, and two from private life.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 293, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution. In carrying out such purposes the Commission shall give particular attention to—

(1) the impact of the space age upon manpower requirements of the Armed Forces;

(2) the adequacy of existing programs for training personnel of the Armed Forces to operate and service the advanced weaponry of the space age, and whether the lack of trained personnel impairs or lessens the value of technological advances in weaponry;

(3) the training requirements of the civilian components of national defense in the space age;

(4) the adequacy of existing procedures for meeting overall manpower needs for national defense in the space age;

(5) ways and means for the more effective utilization of adequately trained manpower to meet the needs of the space age; and

(6) ways and means for creating the reservoir of experts, technicians, planners, leaders and others who are essential to balanced progress in the domestic economy.

(b) The Commission, not later than February 1, 1962, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report. Such report shall contain the findings and recommendations of the Commission, together with such proposals for legislative or administrative action as it may deem necessary or desirable. The Commission may also submit such interim reports as it may deem advisable.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commisison or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon requests made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. On the sixtieth day after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3(b) of this joint resolution, the Commission shall cease to exist.

BIBLE ANNIVERSARY YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a beloved and great American, Abraham Lincoln, said of the Bible that it is "The best gift God has given man." I am sure we would emphatically agree. As a matter of fact, here in this body we hear the Bible quoted daily. It has enriched our lives spiritually; it has given us strength to go on in the face of adversity; it has been, is, and shall always be a source of comfort, solace, and encouragement to generations throughout the world and generations yet to come.

The years 1960 and 1961 are significant as anniversary years in the history of the Bible in English. The Rheims-Douay translation was completed in 1610—just a little over 350 years ago—and the King James version will have its 350th anniversary this year. The Bible, or at least one book of it, has been translated into more than 1,150 languages. The Bible, as we know, is one of the most widely read books in the world and certainly has had a more dramatic career than any other book.

The year 1961 is a year when more than ever we will face the need for renewed faith, and our Nation, founded by religious men and women, should be encouraged to turn for strength to the ultimate source of all strength—in the Word of God.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar year, 1961, as "Bible Anniversary Year."

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "The Best Gift," by Clifton Fadiman, which appeared in This Week magazine on December 25, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 61) to provide for the designation of the calendar year 1961 as "Bible Anniversary Year," introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

THE BEST BOOK GOD HAS GIVEN MAN

(By Clifton Fadiman)

This is a good day for all of us to remember Abraham Lincoln's words about the Bible: "The best gift God has given man," he called it. It is by all odds the most influential book (or, rather, collection of books) in existence. The Old and New Testaments have held men together spiritually through the centuries.

The language of the Bible has colored the thoughts of untold millions. It has become so much a part of our speech that a man of the West can hardly pass a day without quoting from it, though he may never have read it through. If we speak of the "signs of the times" or a "pearl of great price," or the "salt of the earth" or a "house divided against itself"—it is the Bible that we are quoting. Especially during the Christmas season, the wonderful words of the Scriptures meet us at every turn.

In the open letter on the opposite page, addressed to our President-elect, you will read that we are in the midst of several important Bible anniversaries. The new year will mark the 350th anniversary of the so-called Authorized, or King James, Version. Three hundred and fifty years ago, in 1611,

54 devoted English scholars and churchmen, assigned to the task by King James I, gave to the English-speaking world a monument of noble prose, on which so many of us have been brought up.

This version was based on others that had preceded it, as well as on the original Greek and Hebrew; and it has been followed by several revised versions. It is only one of many famous translations. Three hundred and fifty years ago this year, the "Douay" Old Testament was completed. That, combined with the Rheims New Testament, remains the official English version for the Roman Catholic faith.

Over and above these anniversaries, on March 14 of the approaching year the combined presses of Oxford and Cambridge Universities will issue simultaneously in every English-speaking country in the world a completely fresh translation of the New Testament. The official title is "The New English Bible: New Testament." It will be followed at some future time by the Old Testament.

March 14, then, will prove another all-important date in the history of the Bible. The new translation will be the product of almost 15 years of work by nearly 70 of the world's greatest religious scholars. They have taken advantage of every advance in Biblical knowledge, and also every scrap of recent discovery about the original sources of the New Testament.

The cost of this great project has been more than half a million dollars. The first printing will be nearly a million copies. And though, for technical reasons, there is great secrecy about the text of the new version, I can promise that it will make great news on publication. In many respects the style differs dramatically from the present King James version.

I have had the privilege of examining the book while it was still in proof, and I can at this early date report its aim: "Consistently to use the idiom of contemporary English to convey the meaning of the Greek." It tries to do for us what King James' men did for the Englishman of 1611.

And so this version will join the hundreds, even thousands, of other translations of the Bible, from St. Jerome's 5th century Latin Vulgate right up to the present.

The Bible, or at least one book of it, has been translated into more than 1,150 languages. I am purposely being a little vague, for the American Bible Society reports the astonishing fact that new translations, 1,960 years after the birth of Christ, are appearing constantly at the rate of more than one a month. The New Testament exists complete in more than 490 languages, from Ainu to Zande, tongues whose very names are strange to us. In short, the Bible has had the most dramatic career of any book in the world.

And to all our readers on Christmas, Read It Now could not possibly recommend any passage half so beautiful as the Christmas Story from Luke, starting with verse 8, chapter 2: "And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night."

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which calls for a two-pronged investigation into certain activities of the U.S. Air Force.

First, my proposed investigation would seek to determine whether the responsible officials of the U.S. Air Force, and its purchasing agent, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, are properly carrying out their duty under the fifth amendment to the Constitution to pay just compensation for all property rights taken by the respective agencies.

Second, the investigation would inquire into the present safety regulations of the Air Force in an attempt to determine if, under present-day conditions, they are adequate to insure that the lives and property of residents in those areas contiguous to Air Force bases throughout the United States are sufficiently safeguarded. My resolution also provides for the recommendation of corrective legislation in both areas if any should be required.

The first phase of the proposed investigation is occasioned by the untenable position taken by the Department of the Air Force, through its negotiating and purchasing agent, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in connection with the acquisition of clearance easements—which prevent obstructions over specified heights and permits the Government to top trees, and so forth—in the area of Andrews Air Force Base at Camp Springs, Md.; and its complete refusal to negotiate or even discuss with the property owners the question of compensation for avigation easements—which it is also taking.

The Andrews base has been in Maryland for a number of years—since approximately 1943—and all Marylanders recognize the national security need for the base. They do not object to its presence but sincerely feel that they should receive compensation consistent with the criterion spelled out by the Constitution for all property rights taken by the Government. They dislike disputing with the Government of the country they so dearly love; but the Constitution is superior to the men of government and it gives these citizens a right of compensation and imposes upon the Government a duty to pay. Unfortunately, the Government is reluctant to do so.

The present problem is primarily the result of progress—the coming of the jet age. Airplanes have used Andrews on a daily basis since 1943 and for the most part the military officials have been more than cooperative. In one instance a runway was changed at least in part because of the danger the aircraft caused to the surrounding areas.

During the day of the piston-powered aircraft, when the craft left the ground it was well within the confines of the base and gained considerable altitude before passing over homes and other buildings in the locale.

The situation has changed, however, with the advent of huge jet aircraft which require more time to get off the ground. As a result longer runways of the 10,000-foot variety are necessitated.

Andrews Air Force Base already has one such runway which is sufficient to accommodate the largest of the military jets. A second such runway is presently under construction and is expected to be completed shortly.

Upon its completion it has been announced that all military air operations in the Washington area will be from Andrews. Bolling Field will be deactivated and its operations also transferred to Andrews. As a result of this adjustment in military air activities, it has been forecast that approximately 30,000 flights per month will enter or leave the base. A very great percentage of those flights will be by the large jet bombers and cargo planes.

Air Force regulations prescribe that there must be no obstructions in established glide planes in the approach and transitional zones of runways. Therefore, through the Corps of Engineers, it has undertaken to negotiate for the acquisition of clearance easements from property owners whose property now lies within the glide plane because of the new, longer runways.

I use the term "negotiate" loosely, however, because negotiation to the Corps of Engineers apparently means getting an appraisal and then dictating an offer to the property owners. There is no further negotiation. The offer is final.

In the words of the Air Force, after the appraisal:

> The offer is based thereon. If the offer * * * is not satisfactory to the landowner, the only course of action is to permit the U.S. district court at Baltimore to determine the amount of the compensation in eminent domain proceedings filed by the Department of Justice at the request of the Air Force.

In other words, the initial offer is the final offer—short of judicial proceedings. There is no negotiation and none is apparently contemplated from the outset by the Air Force.

It is generally accepted in the real estate profession that at least three appraisals are necessary to obtain an adequate and proper evaluation of the value of property or of a property right. Nevertheless, the Corps of Engineers in these Andrews cases obtain only two on some properties—one independent and one by a staff appraiser—and in over 30 percent of the properties affected, it obtained only one appraisal—that by a Corps of Engineers staff appraiser. The offer to the property owner is based upon these appraisals which, of course, are preferential to the Air Force and if the owner is not satisfied with it he must engage in expensive litigation.

No opportunity is given the landowner to have an independent appraisal submitted to the Air Force for administrative consideration with the others in arriving at the amount to be offered as just compensation. He is caught on the horns of a dilemma—either accept the Air Force's initial offer and not get true value, or go to court and possibly still not get true value after legal expenses are offset against a possibly higher award.

The unfair nature of the acquisition procedures of the Air Force does not stop there, however. In some cases the Air Force has demanded clearance easements to the ground and made what are little more than nominal offers.

When an easement to the ground is taken, the landowner has less left than if the property were purchased. He would be better off if he gave his remaining interest away—if he could find a taker—because he is left only with the liabilities of ownership and none of the benefits. If a person happened across the property and broke a leg as a result

of stepping in a hole, the owner, not the Air Force, would be subject to suit.

The Air Force, however, very piously tells landowners thus affected that they still own the mineral rights. Of course, to extract the minerals the owner would have to do it by burrowing underground—if the owner of the adjacent property did not object. All of which presumes in the first place that there is something of value in the ground.

In the case of "avigation easements" the situation is worse. The Corps of Engineers, at Air Force direction, refuses even to discuss them with the property owner in any way.

An avigation easement results from the frequent and regular flights of aircraft at low levels over property with a resultant decrease in the value of the property. The scope of the easement and, therefore, the amount of compensation, is determined by the frequency of the flights, altitude, type of airplane, and whether the easement will be permanent or temporary.

The Supreme Court has recognized that the taking of such easements constitutes the deprivation of a right inherent in a landowner's property and, therefore, subject to the same right of just compensation under the fifth amendment as any other property right.

Nevertheless, the Air Force takes the position that it will take avigation easements and will not discuss compensation with the property owners. It contends it has the right to fly its airplanes over property even at very low altitudes—and it undoubtedly does. But only for the same reason that the Government can deprive a person of any property or property right—because it has the right of eminent domain. Before the Government has a right in the property superior to the owner's, however, it must condemn the property or acquire it in accordance with law.

The Air Force obviously takes the intractable position it does as regards avigation easements because of the inability of the owner to physically prevent the flights. In other cases he can prevent the Government from taking the easement until the proper legal procedures have been taken because he can stop Government agents from coming onto his property. The burden in the case of avigation easements is thus thrown on the hardpressed landowner to initiate expensive legal proceedings in order to be compensated for his loss. Meanwhile, the Air Force sits back smugly, content with its argument that it does not need a prior condemnation and repudiates and ignores its constitutional duty.

The Air Force has stated its position on this subject to me as follows:

> The Air Force may fly its aircraft, even at very low altitudes, over private property without prior resort to legal process. Thus, there is no operational requirement for the Air Force to initiate action to pursue or condemn * * * (avigation) easements.

It fails to recognize that the fifth amendment requires it. At any event, it would be much more inexpensive for the Government in the long run if they would initially handle these problems administratively. The dollar outlay would undoubtedly be less, as would the time wasted by Air Force or Corps of Engineers officers. In addition, an important public relations victory would be scored. Instead the Air Force continues to alienate the people.

Administrative procedures should be set up to compensate for such claims. I am sure it would be to the benefit of the Air Force and the country as a whole if this were done.

As I have already noted, the second phase of my resolution is directed toward a different but related problem—the adequacy of the Air Force safety regulations in light of present day conditions.

The Federal Aviation Agency has published safety regulations which are consistent with the recommendations made in 1952 by the President's Airport Commission, more commonly referred to as the Doolittle Commission, which prescribes that the area included within the runway clear zone should be free of obstruction to the ground. The clear zone is described as that area adjacent to the end of the runway for approximately one-half mile in the case of an instrument runway—and shorter on other runways. The recommendations also prescribe that the area beyond the clear zone for 1½ to 2 miles should be left free of residences and places of public assembly such as schools, hospitals, churches, and so forth.

The activities of the Air Force at Andrews would indicate that its safety regulations are considerably inferior to those of the FAA with the result that the lives and property of citizens in the area are being continuously endangered.

It would appear in the case of Andrews Air Force Base, and possibly other bases throughout the country, that safety is being sacrificed because of monetary considerations.

If this is so, it should not be. My resolution is intended to thoroughly review the entire area of Air Force safety for the purpose of making sure that it has kept pace with the tremendous advances in aviation that have been made in the past few years. Such a review should, of course, thoroughly consider the effect which the bigger and more powerful aircraft that are presently utilizing airfields which were laid out prior to the coming of the jet age have had on the surrounding countryside. There is considerable doubt in my mind that Air Force safety has kept pace or that the rights of citizens in the surrounding areas have been sufficiently considered on a continuing basis. I think a study such as I am proposing here is urgently needed.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

> Whereas the United States Air Force is in the process of constructing a new 10,000 foot north-south runway parallel to and 2,000 feet from the existing north-south runway at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland; and
>
> Whereas the United States Air Force contemplates the utilization of these two runways by large multi-engined jet aircraft to the extent of 30,000 flights per month; and
>
> Whereas the flyways at the end of both of these runways are over densely populated areas including schools; and
>
> Whereas the United States Air Force, through the United States Army Corps of Engineers, is negotiating with property owners in the approach and transitional zones of the two north-south runways in order to obtain clearance assessments in conformance with Air Force regulations requiring the elimination of all obstructions above prescribed heights in the approach and transitional zones of the runways; and
>
> Whereas the United States Air Force is offering meager and totally unreasonable sums for the aforementioned clearance easements and refuses to supply the property owners with information which is necessary from the property owners standpoint to get a reasonable appraisal from an independent real estate appraiser of the actual value of the easement being taken; and
>
> Wheres the United States Air Force contemplates taking an avigation easement from certain of the property owners and does not intend to compensate them therefor in accordance with the duty imposed upon them by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution; and
>
> Whereas the Federal Aviation Agency has recently published safety recommendations, in line with the recommendations of the "Doolittle Commission", which prescribe that the area included within the clear zone, that area adjacent to the end of a runway extending out in a fan shape from the end of the runway for approximately one-half mile on an instrument runway for large aircraft, should be clear of obstructions to the ground; and
>
> Whereas the same report recommends that the area beyond the clear zone for one and one-half to two miles should be kept free of residences and places of public assembly such as schools, hospitals, and churches; now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a full and complete investigation to determine whether the responsible officials of the United States Air Force and the United States Army Corps of Engineers are carrying out their duty under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution to award "just compensation" for all property rights taken by the Government and to recommend to the Senate, what, if any, legislation is needed to correct existing deficiencies and to make findings of fact and recommendations to the United States Senate outlining how the Air Force can or should correct its procedures; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the Committee's investigation also seek to determine whether the United States Air Force safety regulations are adequate under present day conditions to insure that the lives and property of citizens in those areas contiguous to Air Force bases throughout the country are properly protected, and to recommend to the United States Senate whatever corrective legislation, if any, is needed or what corrective action, if any, should be taken by the Department of the Air Force.

CREATION OF SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL FUELS STUDY IS INTRODUCED; JOINT COMMITTEE APPROACH REJECTED IN HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would create a special

committee to be known as the Special Committee on a National Fuels Study.

On January 9, 1961, for myself and Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, and a substantial number of my colleagues, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study. At last count, 55 Senators endorsed this measure through cosponsorship, and I understand others have indicated their interest and desire to support a national fuels study.

More than twoscore similar concurrent resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives proposing the joint committee approach to a national fuels study.

Last week, however, the House Committee on Rules rejected a typical resolution for a joint committee, but reported favorably a House resolution to create a House Select Committee on a National Fuels Study.

The House resolution does not embrace language which, I am informed, the 10 Senators from New England States, along with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], consider to be essential to a national fuels study agenda satisfactory to them.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I have introduced the new Senate resolution today for myself and Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, for three primary reasons:

First, by reason of House leadership objection to the joint committee approach and last week's action by the House Rules Committee, it would be inappropriate for us to consider and act upon Senate Concurrent Resolution 4.

Second, I believe there is majority opinion in the Senate that a national fuels study is necessary. This fact is attested to by the 55 cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4.

Third, a comprehensive national fuels study should embrace the so-called New England amendments, proposed in the Senate by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on February 9, 1961, for himself, the nine other Senators of both parties from New England States, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. These amendments, proposed for inclusion in Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, are printed on page 1902 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Senate—together with Senator PASTORE'S cogent remarks.

Mr. President, the new Senate resolution introduced today embraces in full the language proposed by Senator PASTORE and his cosponsors, as properly should be the case. Likewise, some language differing from Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 as introduced has been written into the new measure in order to reflect concurring views of spokesmen for substantial segments of the three major natural resource fuels—coal, oil, and gas.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should adopt this resolution for the same reasons I expressed when I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 on January 9. It is my opinion that this measure is in considerably better form and is much more acceptable to the industries involved, as well as to the original cosponsors and additional Senators who were not listed as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4.

With the so-called New England amendments included, the agenda for the proposed committee is clearly in the national interest and definitely would take into account considerations relating to fuels and energy resource availability, production, and marketing, as well as consumer needs and interests.

A thorough, factual, equitable, and impartial study of the Nation's fuel and energy resources is essential—and I underscore the admonition that such a study be impartial. I have never entertained any other concept of the mission of a committee entrusted with the responsibility to make a national fuels study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk through Tuesday, March 7, 1961, to enable additional Senators to give consideration to joining as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas adequate supplies of fuel and energy resources in all forms are essential to the continued welfare of the Nation, to its industrial development, to the consuming public, and to the national security; and

Whereas authoritative estimates forecast that by 1980 the population of the United States will increase to two hundred and fifty million and that the consumption of fuel and energy resources will have increased by nearly 100 per centum; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to encourage development of adequate supplies of energy to meet increasing requirements and to maintain our national energy supremacy; and

Whereas a study of our existing and prospective national fuel and energy resources is desirable to determine the amounts and availability of all of our fuel and energy resources; and

Whereas the maintenance of adequate fuel supplies, the stability and prosperity of the basic fuel industries, adequate facilities for the transportation of fuel and energy resources, and the necessary manpower and machinery to make these resources available are essential to national defense and security; and to the general economy of our Nation; and

Whereas there now exist various governmental policies and laws which play a vital role in the development of our energy resources and properly are subject to periodic review by the Congress; and

Whereas in view of these and other considerations it appears that a Senate committee study of the fuels industries is desirable to determine what, if any, changes in and implementation of existing and prospective governmental policies and laws may be desirable in order to coordinate and provide an effective national fuels policy in order to assure a continuation of this Nation's energy supremacy: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on a National Fuels Study and to consist of nine Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution. The President of the Senate shall designate one such Senator as chairman of the committee. Six members of the committee shall be appointed from the majority party and three members from the minority party.

SEC. 2. No legislative measure shall be referred to such committee, and it shall not have power to report any such measure to the Senate.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall—

(1) make a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the current and prospective fuel and energy resources of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; and

(2) make a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting the fuels and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws may be advisable in order to coordinate and provide an effective national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels and energy adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account the investment by private enterprise for the maintenance of efficient and adequate fuels and necessary related industries and the necessity for the maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the committee shall, in addition to such other matters as it may deem necessary, give consideration to—

(1) the proved and predicted availabilities of our national fuel and energy resources in all forms and factors pertinent thereto;

(2) projected national requirements for the utilization of these resources both to meet immediate demands and to provide for future expansion of the economy;

(3) the interests of the consuming public, including the availability in all regions of the country of an adequate supply of various fuels at reasonable prices and including the maintenance of a sound competitive structure in the supply and distribution of fuel to both industry and the consuming public;

(4) technological developments, in progress and in prospect, including desirable areas for further exploration and technological research;

(5) existing competitive patterns in the distribution and marketing of fuel oil including the effect on all regions of the county of adequate supplies of all types of fuels;

(6) the effect upon the consuming public and user industries of any recommendations made under this study, and of existing governmental programs and policies now in effect;

(7) the effect of any recommendations made pursuant to this study on economic concentrations in industry, particularly as these recommendations may affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of fuel;

(8) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon the individual fuel and energy industries, but also their impact upon related and competing fuels and their interaction with other governmental programs; and

(9) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant considerations, including proposed amendments to such existing laws as the Federal Power Act, the Natural Gas Act, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective fuels program.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through January 2, 1963, technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee. With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $200,000 during any fiscal year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 8. The committee shall report the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 2, 1963. The committee shall cease to exist at the termination of January 2, 1963.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BENNETT (for himself of Mr. Moss) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 912, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 20, and February 28, 1961, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, PELL, RANDOLPH, JACKSON, CLARK, MCNAMARA, NEUBERGER, MOSS, METCALF, CHAVEZ, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BYRD of West Virginia, FULBRIGHT, BURDICK, MAGNUSON, MUSKIE, CHURCH, MCGEE, and YARBOROUGH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by Mr. MORSE on February 20, 1961.

EXTENSION OF LAWS RELATING TO FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 28, 1961, the name of Mr. BLAKLEY was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1109) to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) on February 28, 1961.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] be included as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

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

AID TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be included as cosponsors of S. 336, a bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be added as cosponsors to S. 861, the bill I have introduced to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956.

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

TWO-YEAR PERIOD IN WHICH TO REINSTATE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the next printing of the bill (S. 977) to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, that the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] be added as cosponsors.

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

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—IMPACTED SCHOOL AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF THE BILL

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on February 28 I introduced a bill (S. 1078) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws. I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as cosponsors to the bill, and that their names be added on the next printing of the bill.

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

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

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Letter to President Kennedy from him and other Senators protesting the recent increase in the residual fuel oil import quota.

PERMANENT PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 98)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was sent to the House yesterday and printed in the RECORD. Without objection, the message will be referred and printed in the RECORD without reading.

The President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend to the Congress the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps—a pool of trained American men and women sent overseas by the U.S. Government or through private organizations and institutions to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower.

I have today signed an Executive order establishing a Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis.

The temporary Peace Corps will be a source of information and experience to aid us in formulating more effective plans for a permanent organization. In addition, by starting the Peace Corps now we will be able to begin training young men and women for oversea duty this summer with the objective of placing them in oversea positions by late fall. This temporary Peace Corps is being established under existing authority in the Mutual Security Act and will be located in the Department of State. Its initial expenses will be paid from appropriations currently available for our foreign aid program.

Throughout the world the people of the newly developing nations are struggling for economic and social progress which reflects their deepest desires. Our own freedom, and the future of freedom around the world, depend, in a very real sense, on their ability to build growing and independent nations where men can live in dignity, liberated from the bonds of hunger, ignorance, and poverty.

One of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of this goal is the lack of trained men and women with the skill to teach the young and assist in the operation of development projects—men and women with the capacity to cope with the demands of swiftly evolving economies, and with the dedication to put that capacity to work in the villages, the mountains, the towns, and the factories of dozens of struggling nations.

The vast task of economic development urgently requires skilled people to do the work of the society—to help teach in the schools, construct development projects, demonstrate modern methods of sanitation in the villages, and perform a hundred other tasks calling for training and advanced knowledge.

To meet this urgent need for skilled manpower we are proposing the establishment of a Peace Corps—an organization which will recruit and train American volunteers, sending them abroad to work with the people of other nations.

This organization will differ from existing assistance programs in that its members will supplement technical advisers by offering the specific skills needed by developing nations if they are to put technical advice to work. They will help provide the skilled manpower necessary to carry out the development projects planned by the host governments, acting at a working level and serving at great personal sacrifice. There is little doubt that the number of those who wish to serve will be far greater than our capacity to absorb them.

The Peace Corps or some similar approach has been strongly advocated by Senator HUMPHREY, Representative REUSS, and others in the Congress. It has received strong support from universities, voluntary agencies, student groups, labor unions, and business and professional organizations.

Last session, the Congress authorized a study of these possibilities. Preliminary reports of this study show that the Peace Corps is feasible, needed, and wanted by many foreign countries.

Most heartening of all, the initial reaction to this proposal has been an enthusiastic response by student groups, professional organizations, and private citizens everywhere—a convincing demonstration that we have in this country an immense reservoir of dedicated men and women willing to devote their energies and time and toil to the cause of world peace and human progress.

Among the specific programs to which Peace Corps members contribute are: teaching in primary and secondary schools, especially as part of national English language teaching programs; participation in the worldwide program of malaria eradication; instruction and operation of public health and sanitation projects; aiding in village development through school construction and other programs; increasing rural agricultural productivity by assisting local farmers to use modern implements and techniques. The initial emphasis of these programs will be on teaching. Thus the Peace Corps members will be an effective means of implementing the development programs of the host countries—programs which our technical assistance operations have helped to formulate.

The Peace Corps will not be limited to the young, or to college graduates. All Americans who are qualified will be welcome to join this effort. But undoubtedly the Corps will be made up primarily of young people as they complete their formal education.

Because one of the greatest resources of a free society is the strength and diversity of its private organizations and institutions much of the Peace Corps program will be carried out by these groups, financially assisted by the Federal Government.

Peace Corps personnel will be made available to developing nations in the following ways:

1. Through private voluntary agencies carrying on international assistance programs.
2. Through oversea programs of colleges and universities.
3. Through assistance programs of international agencies.
4. Through assistance programs of the U.S. Government.
5. Through new programs which the Peace Corps itself directly administers.

In the majority of cases the Peace Corps will assume the entire responsibility for recruitment, training, and the development of oversea projects. In other cases it will make available a pool of trained applicants to private groups who are carrying out projects approved by the Peace Corps.

In the case of Peace Corps programs conducted through voluntary agencies and universities, these private institutions will have the option of using the national recruitment system—the central pool of trained manpower—or developing recruitment systems of their own.

In all cases men and women recruited as a result of Federal assistance will be members of the Peace Corps and enrolled in the central organization. All private recruitment and training programs will adhere to Peace Corps standards as a condition of Federal assistance.

In all instances the men and women of the Peace Corps will go only to those countries where their services and skills are genuinely needed and desired. U.S. operations missions, supplemented where necessary by special Peace Corps teams, will consult with leaders in foreign countries in order to determine where Peace Corps men are needed, the types of job they can best fill, and the number of people who can be usefully employed. The Peace Corps will not supply personnel for marginal undertakings without a sound economic or social justification. In furnishing assistance through the Peace Corps careful regard will be given to the particular country's developmental priorities.

Membership in the Peace Corps will be open to all Americans, and applications will be available shortly. Where application is made directly to the Peace Corps—the vast majority of cases—they will be carefully screened to make sure that those who are selected can contribute to Peace Corps programs, and have the personal qualities which will enable them to represent the United States abroad with honor and dignity. In those cases where application is made directly to a private group, the same basic standards will be maintained. Each new recruit will receive a training and orientation period varying from 6 weeks to 6 months. This training will include courses in the culture and language of the country to which they are being sent and specialized training designed to increase the work skills of recruits. In some cases training will be conducted by participant agencies and universities in approved training programs. Other training programs will be conducted by the Peace Corps staff.

Length of service in the c[illegible] will vary depending on the kind of project and the country, generally ranging from 2 to 3 years. Peace Corps members will often serve under conditions of physical hardship, living under primitive conditions among the people of developing nations. For every Peace Corps member service will mean a great financial sacrifice. They will receive no salary. Instead they will be given an allowance which will only be sufficient to meet their basic needs and maintain health. It is essential that Peace Corps men and women live simply and unostentatiously among the people they have come to assist. At the conclusion of their tours, members of the Peace Corps will receive a small sum in the form of severance pay based on length of service abroad to assist them during their first weeks back in the United States. Service with the Peace Corps will not exempt volunteers from Selective Service.

The United States will assume responsibility for supplying medical services to Peace Corps members and ensuring supplies and drugs necessary to good health.

I have asked the temporary Peace Corps to begin plans and make arrangements for pilot programs. A minimum of several hundred volunteers could be selected, trained and at work abroad by the end of this calendar year. It is hoped that within a few years several thousand Peace Corps members will be working in foreign lands.

It is important to remember that this program must, in its early stages, be experimental in nature. This is a new dimension in our oversea program and only the most careful planning and negotiation can insure its success.

The benefits of the Peace Corps will not be limited to the countries in which it serves. Our own young men and women will be enriched by the experience of living and working in foreign lands. They will have acquired new skills and experience which will aid them in their future careers and add to our own country's supply of trained personnel and teachers. They will return better able to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship and with greater understanding of our global responsibilities.

Although this is an American Peace Corps, the problem of world development is not just an American problem. Let us hope that other nations will mobilize the spirit and energies and skill of their people in some form of Peace Corps—making our own effort only one step in a major international effort to increase the welfare of all men and improve understanding among nations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1961.*

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY VALLEY FORGE PATRIOTS AWARD TO PFC. TIMOTHY J. CHWALA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was delighted to learn that Pfc. Timothy J. Chwala, of Illinois, was the second place winner of the George Washington Honor Medal, together with a $500 cash prize for an essay in the Valley Forge Patriots Award contest, which is limited to members of Armed Forces personnel.

It is with high pride that I submit his letter on "My Vote: Freedom's Privilege," and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

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

MY VOTE: FREEDOM'S PRIVILEGE

(By Pfc. Timothy J. Chwala)

If all other rights were suddenly denied, and only the freedom to vote remained, what fool would cast the first ballot? Man never chooses tyranny. He carelessly abandons freedom and prepares the way for more powerful dictators who might allow him this one privilege if only as the most distinctive relic to mock the hope of yesterday's democracy. The least understood and most neglected of our privileges could easily become the worst form of despair under tyranny.

Not all citizens who should vote, necessarily do, and not all those who vote, necessarily take an active part in other important government affairs. Yet if freedom fails, the fault is not in our ideals, but in ourselves. The importance of my vote is clearly understood, not merely as a part of the entire democratic process, but as a vital part of the nature of man.

The true nature of man can only be understood in relation to his Creator. Since God has entrusted man with the highest office in the physical world by giving him reason and free will, man can honor that trust by accepting and defending the highest office of the human commonwealth, a citizen of a free society. Both offices require certain responsibilities no greater than man's innate capacity to assume.

If either office were unattainable, then man's search for his rightful place in the universe and society would mean nothing more than an endless flight to a never-never land. But man not only has the capacity to love and know truth, he has the stubborn genius to act upon it. He not only has the capacity to love freedom, but the invincible courage to act upon it, fight for it, and die for it, if necessary. His ideals are a part of his innermost being, electing his thoughts, governing his actions, and leading him to victory in the hour of crisis.

Without truth, my free will and reason are meaningless, and without freedom, my vote is insignificant. Yet if I fail to use my free will and reason to search the truth, if I abandon the most important responsibility of freedom, personal decision, then I not only fail in both offices, as man and citizen, but for tomorrow's heritage.

Communism reduces man to less than an ape, and the citizen to a puppet of the state, yet lie cannot efface the truth. The state is a poor substitute for man, for while it robs him of his rightful place before God, it cannot devour the rights that belong to man alone, and still pretend to be beneficial to all men.

The ultimate victory of freedom is found in its universal truth. It never betrays the true nature and dignity of man. If we are faithful to this truth, freedom is faithful to us, and in the final test, a reality for all men.

With a new sense of pride and gratitude for all the centuries of struggle and sacrifice in the long campaign that made this, my first election, a reality, I fully accept my office as citizen of a free nation knowing that each time I cast my vote, freedom votes for me.

ANNIVERSARY OF BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 3, 1878, the Bulgarian people gained their independence from the Ottoman Empire, under which they had been oppressed for a number of centuries. That freedom was enjoyed by the Bulgarian people for over 60 years when again, after the sacrifice of many lives, the Bulgarian people fell in their struggle against the present Communist domination of a large sector of Eastern Europe. Although the Bulgarian people behind the Iron Curtain cannot speak for themselves, the Bulgarians living in the freedom-loving countries of the world can and do speak for them, urging those officials who are representing them at the United Nations to do whatever they can to aid the cause of freedom-loving people everywhere.

For the last 2 months Members of Congress have been commemorating the independence day of numerous countries which are now behind the Iron Curtain, and it is hoped that the voice of these people who are under the yoke of communism against their will will be able to enjoy the freedom and way of life that was intended for man to live.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, March 3 will mark the 83d anniversary of the liberation of the Republic of Bulgaria from Czarist Russia. Today, though Bulgaria once again is under bondage to Communist Russia, it is fitting that we recall Bulgaria's honorable and distinctive history and the national spirit of freedom and liberty for which the Bulgarian people are famed. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, which I have released to the Bulgarian National Front in America be printed in the RECORD.

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

DR. KALIN KOICHEFF,
Secretary, Central Executive Board of the Bulgarian National Front.

DEAR DR. KOICHEFF: I regret that previous commitments makes my presence at the annual banquet and ball on Bulgarian Liberation Day impossible. However, I am most happy to express my admiration and friendship both to the members of the Bulgarian National Front here in America and to the Bulgarian people now held in captivity by a ruthless Soviet dictatorship.

Bulgarians have for long centuries made important contributions to European civilization and its people have consistently fought for freedom and independence against the czarist Russians, the Byzantine and Turkish Empires.

The liberation of Bulgaria in 1878 by Imperial Russia and the adoption of the Tirnova constitution were milestones for these lovers of liberty. Then came years of progress and independence. However, on September 8, 1944, Bulgaria was cruelly invaded by their ancient enemy, Russia. The democratic government was overthrown and its leaders imprisoned or liquidated.

Americans and the citizens of all the free nations still look toward Bulgaria in friendship and hope. It is our hope and belief that the Republic of Bulgaria will once again become a free and full partner of the community of free nations and its people will again enjoy the fruits of liberty and democracy.

Let us assure our friends behind the Iron Curtain that they are remembered on this commemorative occasion and that our prayers rise in their behalf constantly.

I note that this is the 10th anniversary of the establishment in the United States of your organization and I extend my best wishes to your membership and leaders.

With best personal good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 3 is Liberation Day, cherished by all freedom-loving Bulgarians, including Americans of Bulgarian descent. Eighty-three years ago, on March 3, 1878, the dreams of the Bulgarian people to be masters of their homeland came true, after long years of suffering, tears and the sacrifice of patriots, as well as help from friends abroad.

It was in the 19th century, not long after our own Civil War. At that time, of course, the United States could not be as instrumental as czarist Russia or other world powers in shaping the history of the Balkans, some 5,000 miles away. Yet some prominent Americans—Correspondent MacGahan; diplomats Schuyler and later Markham; missionary Dr. Long—left a tradition which evoked deep affection and high esteem in the hearts of the Bulgarian people for the United States and the American people. Tangible expression of these feelings was seen in the names given to some streets in Sofia and other Bulgarian towns—George Washington, Carnegie, Dr. Long, and so forth.

Since its independence, Bulgaria has known many ups and downs, economically and politically. And often at dark moments the Bulgarian people looked toward America. At one such time, the principles of self-determination enumerated by the Father of the League of Nations, President Woodrow Wilson, gave to Bulgarians the hope of a better future.

Now, as Bulgarian Liberation Day is commemorated, we have the opportunity to recall the longstanding contribution of these Americans to the welfare of Bulgaria as a shining example of our feelings toward the Bulgarian people. We wish for them, as we have always wished, only prosperity, liberty and the opportunity to pursue happiness.

Mr. President, the Bulgarian National Front of America has sent me a summary of Bulgaria's long history and on the eve of this important anniversary I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY, MARCH 3, 1878

For the past 83 years March the third has been commemorated by the entire Bulgarian people, irrespective of political persuasion, as the Bulgarian Liberation Day. The Act of San Stefano, signed on this day by the imperial Russian Government and the Ottoman Empire, restored the independent Bulgarian state and ended a 500 years foreign oppression of the Bulgarian people.

The liberation of Bulgaria followed a long self-sacrificing struggle for freedom led by such gallant patriots like George Rakovski, Vasil Levski and Christo Botev and was immediately preceded by a national uprising which won the sympathy of the world and the indignation of all humanity, led by William Gladstone, against the outrageous atrocities committed by the much stronger oppressors. Yet this uprising made European intervention unavoidable and Bulgaria was liberated.

In their long history the Bulgarians have made a humble but important contribution to European civilization and have withstood their right to independence and freedom against powerful empires and foreign cultural influences. The Byzantine Empire, with illustrious culture and military might, failed to subdue and assimilate the Bulgarian nation. The Ottoman Empire crumbled after a five centuries rule in the Balkans, but the Bulgarian people survived. March the third opened the way for the Bulgarian people to join again the community of European nations.

The first Bulgarian Empire which lasted from 681 to 1018 A.D. became the cradle of the Slavic civilization. It was here that the work of the apostles of the Slavs, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, the first Slavic alphabet, found a fertile soil and developed into a powerful literary tradition continuing up to this day in Russia, Bulgaria, Ukraine,

Serbia and Byelorussia. This literary tradition began in Bulgaria in the ninth century, and was originally based on the old Bulgarian language, and subsequently spread throughout the Eastern Slavic world to form the basis of the national cultures of the Slavic nations.

It was in Bulgaria that the ancient Christian civilization, represented by Byzantium, was converted into a Slavic-Byzantine civilization, a kind of cultural revolution, which reflected the spirit of freedom and independence manifested many a time by the Bulgarians.

It was in Bulgaria that the authority of the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople was first challenged in the ninth century for the sake of national independence and an independent Bulgarian patriarchate was established, thus effecting the first reformation of the Christian church.

It was in Bulgaria that the first socio-economic peasant revolutionary movement—the Bogomilism—started and challenged Byzantine autocracy imitated by the Bulgarian monarchs, feudalism and clericalism. This movement spread in Western Europe and prepared the ground for the future European reformation. It was another manifestation of the spirit of independence animating the Bulgarian people throughout its history.

The liberation of Bulgaria in 1878 by imperial Russia opened new perspectives for the Bulgarian people. A freely elected national assembly adopted the Tirnovo Constitution, against the opposition of reactionary Russia, which is still considered to be the most liberal democratic document in Bulgarian history and venerated as the Bulgarian Magna Charta Libertatum. Invalidated by the present Communist regime, this constitution became the rallying point for the democratic forces opposing communism in Bulgaria.

The spirit of freedom and independence, deeply rooted in the soul of the Bulgarian and repeatedly manifested throughout its history, became the cornerstone of Bulgarian politics right after the liberation. The Bulgarian people gave overwhelming support to the democratic liberal groups against the conservative parties—obedient tools of Russian diplomacy in the Balkans—and did not hesitate to sever diplomatic relations with Russia when she attempted to deprive the liberated Bulgarian people of its freedoms and independence. In its very inception as an independent state, though a creation of Russia, Bulgaria refused to accept the status of a satellite and dealt a serious blow to Russian imperialism in the Balkans.

Prior to its liberation, and even up to 1919, the Bulgarian people had found full understanding and generous support for its national aspirations from American public opinion. The names of Dr. Rigs, Dr. Albert Long, Dr. Washburn and a number of other prominent Americans of the last century have left a tradition of deep affection in the hearts of the Bulgarians for the United States.

It was the Carnegie Commission, appointed by Dr. Nicholas Butler, president of Columbia University, in his capacity as chairman of the Division for International Relations of the Carnegie Endowment which investigated the Balkan affairs in 1913 and came out with a massive report in support of Bulgaria.

It was the U.S. Minister in Bucharest, 1913, who pleaded at the Bucharest Conference for the rights of the Bulgarian minorities. His suggestions were rejected by Greece and Serbia and the Balkans have never had peace ever since.

On September 8, 1944, Bulgaria was invaded by the Russian armies and the Bulgarian Democratic Government coalition of the National Agrarian Union and the Democratic Party was overthrown. A Communist controlled government was established and Bulgaria became a satellite to Communist Russia. The terror which overwhelmed the country and the thousands of victims are indescribable and innumerable. Bulgaria lost its independence and the Bulgarian people its freedom.

Western pressure in 1945–47 forced a temporary relaxation in Bulgaria and an opposition party won the support of the Bulgarian people, but it was disbanded by the Communist Government and its leaders—Nikola Petkov, Dimiter Gitcheff, Kosta Loulcheff, Krastiu Pastuchov, Nikola Moushanov and thousands of others of lesser importance were hanged, imprisoned or otherwise liquidated.

The Bulgarian exiles abroad, loyal to the national tradition of freedom and independence, joined in various groups to support the struggle of the Bulgarian people for freedom from communism and independence from Soviet domination. The Bulgarian National Front of America, representing the patriotic younger generations in Bulgarian politics is on the forefront of this struggle.

In 1954 the Bulgarian National Front of America organized the first solemn celebration of the Bulgarian Liberation Day in New York. Ever since this day became the national holiday of American Bulgarians and an uninterrupted tradition in commemoration of those who have given their lives for the liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman subjugation, those who have fallen in the struggle against Communist oppression and in salutation to those who continue their struggle for freedom in Bulgaria.

THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE BY THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA

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

Mr. President, I think the spotlight should be focused on Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. We should ask him how he can take the initiative in the colonialism issue against free countries, "though mountains of evidence can be produced," as Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, stated, "to substantiate the Soviet Union's imperialism and colonialism both within and on the outside of the Soviet Union." All we need to do, Mr. President, is to look toward Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and those nations entirely eradicated by the Soviet expansion, namely, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

And, Mr. President, we should also look to Laos, and the Congo, and Cuba, and parts of Asia and Africa where the Soviet Union is trying to force upon those people the communistic doctrine; which endeavor, if successful, will subjugate the people and their thinking to the communistic state.

I repeat what I said on the 16th. It is hard for us in this great country, with its many freedoms, where even the most renowned Communists or hardened criminals are given full protection under the Constitution and our laws, to visualize and to understand the struggles, the oppressions, and the deprivations which are afflicted upon the people who were once a part of proud nations but are now under the heel of a Communist dictator. This is all the more reason why we should glory in our own freedom and at the same time give courage to all the people throughout the world who desire to enjoy the freedoms that we have.

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

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the American people should never forget that the Lithuanian people, once free, had their independence destroyed by the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The two dictatorships alternately occupied and oppressed Lithuania during the war years and Russia has controlled that nation for the last 17 years. The Russian occupation has been especially brutal. Tens of thousands of Lithuanians have been killed. The number of deportations to the barren wastes of Siberia has probably run into the hundreds of thousands. The brutal Russian rule of the subject peoples in Eastern Europe gives, indeed, the lie to their claims that they are opposed to colonialism, and are proponents of the right of people to determine their own destiny. Their record proves these claims to be false.

President Roosevelt properly refused to recognize the conquest of the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and instead, recognized their governments-in-exile. In 1954, the Senate passed a resolution which I introduced reaffirming this position, and declaring its support for the ultimate independence of Lithuania, and its sister states of the Baltic. This policy was continued in the celebrated Captive Nations Resolution of 1959, which I had the honor of sponsoring.

It is altogether fitting that we should renew these pledges during this period of the year, in which we celebrate Lithuanian independence. We do not seek, nor promote, futile and costly armed insurrections, nor do we hold out false hopes of armed intervention. But we do wish to tell the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain that we feel for them, and will work for their ultimate liberation.

Only in this way can we keep the fires of hope burning in the hearts of the people of Eastern Europe, and thus build up another effective force to help deter the Russian Communists from attacking the free world.

THE KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Gov. Otto Kerner before the Kaskaskia River Development Commission, at Belleville, Ill., February 23, 1961.

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

It is a privilege to be here in Belleville where we can join together in reaffirming our faith and hope in the future industrial development of southern Illinois. As you know, this administration is deeply concerned with the welfare of all the people in all the towns and cities of Illinois, not just the people in Chicago, or Joliet, or Peoria, or Champaign, or Springfield.

We are keenly aware of the conditions that exist in southern Illinois. Unemployment benefits paid out in 1960 to unemployed workers in 22 southern Illinois counties averaged more than $14.5 million a week. Here in southern Illinois we have a wealth of pent up natural resources and skilled manpower waiting to be loosened * * * waiting to be freed from poverty by new jobs in new industries.

It's time that everyone—all the people in government, private business, and education, and those at work and those looking for work—stopped talking and started doing. It's time for action. Some of the immediate actions which can be taken I spoke about last Saturday at Carbondale.

The Kaskaskia River navigation project is one answer to the problem of industrial growth in southern Illinois. The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers reports that it is technically feasible to improve the Kaskaskia River between Fayetteville and the Mississippi River for modern barge transportation. A bill to accomplish this already has been introduced in Congress.

Passage of the bill will open up a new era for southern Illinois. Its effect will be felt immediately—by tapping the reserve of skilled labor, now unemployed in this area, and putting these men to work. Actually, the men hired to work on the Kaskaskia River project will be building the future of this region in southern Illinois.

Once the Kaskaskia becomes navigable, barges will be able to move raw materials, principally coal, now landlocked, at a nominal cost. And corn, beans, oats, rye, barley, and wheat grown on the farms in the Kaskaskia Valley can be shipped by barge down the Kaskaskia River. Later, when companies build plants along the waterway, the products manufactured in the Kaskaskia Valley can be economically transported by barges to waiting markets.

Opening the Kaskaskia River to commercial barge transportation will make southern Illinois coal readily available at reasonable prices. Coal mine operators estimate that if coal is hauled by barge, it will save them 50 to 71 cents per ton.

There are many potential buyers of Kaskaskia River coal already in the region. Approximately 20 major power generating stations along the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers north to the Ohio River need coal. Many are now using coal delivered by barges. I believe others would buy barge-borne coal if the necessary facilities for receiving this coal were installed.

Looking ahead still further, to the day when the Kaskaskia River Valley with its rich reserve of raw materials, manpower, ample water supply, and cheap water transportation has attracted new industry, more coal will be needed to supply more power for the operation of these industrial plants.

Today only a sprinkling of rowboats is used on the river. But tomorrow, when the channel is deepened, I see the Kaskaskia River becoming a water playground for hundreds of pleasure craft owners.

The Federal Government has estimated the total cost of the navigation improvement project on the Kaskaskia River at $60,500,000. This cost is small in comparison with the long-range dividends it will provide for this area and the entire State of Illinois.

To those who look ahead of today, it means a key to the future industrial development of this area in southern Illinois. It means new industries with new jobs. And, it means that your youngsters can find jobs here, near their homes, their families, and their friends.

This administration is pledged to help southern Illinois help itself. Last weekend members of my cabinet and I met with scores of leaders from southern Illinois to discuss the problem of attracting new industry to this area. Perhaps some of you here tonight were with us in Carbondale for the Southern Illinois Conference on Industrial Attraction. We believe that these leaders understand the many aspects of this problem and are best equipped to make realistic recommendations for correcting them.

We want our State division of industrial planning and development to become more effective, to serve more and more communities by working closer with them. Through a spirit of cooperation that extends to all levels of government, local, State, and Federal * * * that transcends party lines and special interests * * * we know that together we can sell the undeveloped regions of our State to the many industries seeking new plant locations.

Two large companies already have shown they believe in the future development of Southern Illinois and especially the Kaskaskia Valley. They have invested in the future. Kaiser Aluminum, one of the Nation's largest industrial corporations, has bought 2,000 acres of land near Chester as a possible location for a new plant that would employ 2,300 persons. The Illinois Power Co. also has bought acreage in the Kaskaskia Valley near Red Bud.

Active participation by local, State, and Federal Governments is needed to start the wheels of industry turning in southern Illinois. Programs must be developed around highway construction and conservation. Last week I announced that an extra $13 million in highway funds would go to two southern Illinois counties. This money will put 1,000 men to work on Interstate 57 in Williamson and Franklin counties, and is in addition to the $8.5 million already included in the 1961 highway budget for that area. Stepped-up construction on this section of the Interstate System will also mean an earlier opening of this much-needed improvement.

When work is resumed on the Carlyle Dam and Reservoir, there will be more jobs for the citizens of southern Illinois. The Carlyle Dam is a Federal flood control project. Funds to continue construction work on the project are included in the President's budget for fiscal 1962. Funds for preparing engineering plans for a dam and reservoir at Shelbyville also are included in the President's budget. When actual construction of the Shelbyville Dam begins, it will mean more jobs for more citizens.

This administration is determined to bring new industry to southern Illinois. To accomplish this, we must pull together. We must combine and coordinate our efforts. We must realize that a joint local, State and Federal program is needed. We must cooperate with one another. Everyone here tonight must play an active part in this program and must shoulder his share of responsibility. The State of Illinois is ready to step forward to assume an active role in this joint venture that I am sure will benefit not only the economy of southern Illinois, but that of the entire State.

NINETY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF NEBRASKA TO UNION OF STATES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I salute the 94th anniversary of Nebraska's admission to the Union of States. Ninety-four years is more than half the life span of this great Republic—yet it is a short few years in Nebraska's history. It is short when we know traces of a prehistoric culture in western Nebraska are more than 10,000 years old, when history records that the first Europeans—Spaniards—came to Nebraska in 1541, when we recall French voyageurs established fur trade along the Missouri 50 years before the Revolutionary War began. My distinguished colleagues and dear friends from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Virginia will please note that I am privileged to represent territory which was theirs at varying periods during colonial times. Too, a native South Carolinian, Francis Burt, was Nebraska's first Territorial Governor. My colleagues from South Dakota, North Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana sit at the sufferance of Nebraska, for their States were formed from Nebraska territory.

All of us are proud of our States' histories—many significant and unique items can be recounted by each of us. We can all claim many firsts, and their total is the story of America. We are great because so many have done such great things. It has always been my modest contention that when anything important happens anywhere in the world there is a Nebraskan on hand. This was illustrated again 3 or 4 weeks ago when Maj. Harold E. Confer of Culbertson, Nebr. won the Thompson Trophy Award for flying a B–58 bomber, weighing 80 tons, at a speed of 1284.73 miles per hour. The previous world record was 700.4 miles per hour and the Russian record is 639.18 miles per hour. Major Confer not only flew twice as fast as the Russian record but also twice the speed of sound. With typical Nebraska humility he described the flight as routine.

With a proper direction of our efforts, a sensible use of our resources, both human and natural, with an appropriate degree of individual dignity and spirituality, we can always be strong and free. I stress the individual effort because I think it is a superior alternative to Federalized physical culture. It is superior to the notion that "eggheads" can better count your eggs and hatch your chickens than can we. In essence it will direct government to serve and not to master.

I ask Senators to share with me this anniversary, and I bring greetings from a solvent State—one which, by constitution, has no bonded indebtedness. This bright spot in mid-America affords

every comfort and administers to its needs on a pay-as-you-go basis. At Nebraska's current cost of State government we could operate for 60 years on what the Federal Government will spend this year to service the national debt. Nebraskans know every service from government is a bill which must be paid now or later. At home we pay our bills now.

TIME TO STOP TRADE WITH CASTRO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, within 3 weeks after Fidel Castro took power in Cuba—during the time when he was being praised in many quarters in the United States as a political Robin Hood—the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], issued his first note of warning about Castro and his regime.

He publicly questioned the quality of Castro's ambition, his understanding of democracy, and his tolerance.

In the weeks and months that followed, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], time and again voiced warnings and alarms about the lack of free elections in Cuba, the brutal suppression of opposition to Castro, illegal jailings, and the rapid communization of Castro's government.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] called for a firm, courageous, and unyielding State Department policy toward Cuba. In no uncertain terms he denounced the timorous policy and actions on the part of some in our Government which would convey the impression of weakness or indecision in dealing with the Cuban Government.

His record on the subject of Fidel Castro is well known. His prophecies about the complete Communist takeover of Cuba have—unhappily—been borne out.

Now, with Soviet and Red Chinese agents running Cuba as a serf state, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has urged our State Department to order an immediate halt to all U.S. imports from that island—and by doing so deprive Castro of the millions of U.S. dollars which he is now using to finance anti-American propaganda, subversion against the Latin American democracies and general promotion of strife and chaos in our hemisphere.

At the present rate Castro is selling the United States more than $65 million worth of goods each year.

In the February 14 issue of the New York Daily News there appeared an editorial firmly supporting the contention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that this trade with Cuba be halted.

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

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

TIME TO CHOKE THIS GUY

Fidel Castro screeches that he will try to export his Communist revolution by radio, in revenge for alleged airdrops of war material from the United States to Cuban rebels in the Escambray mountains—an allegation we hope is true.

STOP TRADE WITH CASTRO

Our Voice of America announces that it will flood Latin America, beginning Saturday, with a series of hard-hitting anti-Castro programs.

We wish the VOA well, and hope it will pull no punches—though with Edward (born Egbert) R. Murrow in general charge of the operation, we have some misgivings.

Meanwhile, Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, a recognized expert on Latin America, wants the State Department to give the most urgent consideration to an all-out embargo on sales of any goods from the United States to Cuba and vice versa. The main idea would be to cut off the hard U.S. dollars which Castro's government so badly needs.

This looks to us like the proper treatment for Castro—this, plus a U.S. naval and air blockade of all Cuba. Castro will go on insulting and injuring us as long as we'll stand for it and he stays in power. We long ago took more than enough nonsense from him, and why not begin choking him in earnest right now?

THE TRUE LIBERAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very interesting, albeit brief address, delivered by V. Raymond Edman, president of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., on the subject of a "Living Philosophy." This was an address delivered before the Sunday Evening Club of Chicago on January 15 of this year, under the title of, "The True Liberal." I believe liberals, conservatives, and those who have not yet made up their minds as to where they stand will find some serious food for thought in this scholarly address by President Edman.

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

THE TRUE LIBERAL—MESSAGE ON "LIVING PHILOSOPHY" GIVEN AT THE CHICAGO SUNDAY EVENING CLUB, JANUARY 15, 1961

(By V. Raymond Edman, president of Wheaton College)

The mid-20th century American conservative in politics, economics, and religion is today's true liberal. Conversely, the self-styled "liberals" of today are in reality the reactionaries.

Language can be so carelessly used that words can convey a concept contrary to their true meaning. The liberal is a lover of freedom, a free spirit opposed to arbitrary autocracy in thought or deed. The conservative is disposed to maintain existing institutions or views because he believes their principles to be sound. The radical is impatient in his desire for change, irrespective of what direction his program may lead. The reactionary is the real enemy of freedom because he prefers dictatorship and domination by the few over the many. The anarchist is a law unto himself, and is opposed to any restraint whatever. Anarchism is confusion and folly, not freedom; because true freedom, intellectual, political, economic or any kind must be under law. For example, scientific study would be in bondage or constant bewilderment were it not under mathematical laws.

Liberalism and conservatism are not mutually exclusive or contradictory concepts; but that is true of liberalism and reaction. When human freedom in any sphere is denied or greatly restricted, the liberal is opposed to the status quo. However, when a maximum of freedom has been achieved and is threatened by ideologies that are intrinsically destructive of freedom, then the true liberal is the conservative dedicated to maintain the cause of liberty.

There is the illusion today that all change is in the direction of larger freedom. History does not show a steady drift of mankind toward true liberalism. In the realm of government the great revolutions of the past three centuries made marked progress for larger freedom in government. The English Revolution deposed the autocracy and pretended divine right of the Stuart kings and established parliamentary supremacy. The American Revolution provided a great advance in government that is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." The French Revolution toppled the old regime and marked the beginnings of democracy and republicanism on the Continent. The trend toward political liberalism continued until the First World War; and then a marked reaction set in. The fascism of Mussolini, the communism of Lenin, and the nazism of Hitler constituted political reaction in the extreme against liberal government.

The same experience is observed with sadness in the realm of economics. The commercial and industrial revolutions broke the bondage of medieval guilds and the oppressive and restrictive mercantilism of early modern times. Adam Smith was a true, although incomplete, prophet of the coming age. He saw clearly the basic factors implied in the industrial revolution: the increasing division of labor and the exchange economy of the free market. He was the prophet of economic freedom within the bounds of law that would protect the welfare of all. His counterpart, Karl Marx, was an extreme reactionary, and not a liberal in any sense of the word. To curb capitalism he proposed the vast expansion of governmental authority and power at the expense of the citizens. Before dipping his pen into the bitter vitriol of his own heart, he should have pondered the words of a contemporary in America, Abraham Lincoln, who said: "You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich * * * you cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence."

Socialism is reaction, not liberalism. The dictionary itself declares that socialism is "a political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership * * *." It adds, "Socialism favors great extension of governmental action." Communism is the logical development of socialism. Collectivism, whether socialistic or communistic, proposes to abolish the free enterprise system with its individual responsibility and its free market, and to replace it by the coercion of the state through planning boards whose wisdom is allegedly greater than that of the private citizen. Collectivism in any form is the complete negation of liberalism. It is intrinsically authoritarian in government and totalitarian in economic and social regulation.

The same truth that the conservative is today's true liberal prevails in the realm of religion. "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation" declare the Scriptures. The essence of religious freedom is the open Bible available to all who will read, the dynamic message of redemption wrought by the sacrifice of the Savior that delivers the individual soul from the penalty and power of sin, and the promise of a warless world at the return of the King of Kings. This freedom we have achieved. It is our spiritual heritage. Like Thomas Jefferson in the area of politics and Adam Smith in economics, just so the past centuries have produced liberating spirits: Savonarola and Peter Waldo, Martin Luther and John Calvin, John Knox and John Wesley and their successors who have entrusted to us the heritage of the Scriptures, justification by faith and holiness of life. Said the Lord Jesus, "Ye shall know the truth, and

the truth shall make you free," and He added, "I am the truth, the way, and the life." The conservative who believes the Bible and is a witness to the transforming power of the Gospel is a true lover of freedom. Contrariwise, religious radicalism or anarchism which make loud profession of liberalism are in actuality religious reaction.

This is no mere matter of semantics; rather, it is a solemn statement involving the issues of life and death, political, economic, religious. New deals, new frontiers, and new orthodoxies offer fair promises of freedom, but in actuality they are false to true liberty. They offer the illusion of liberalism but in reality are the essence of reaction. We need better men, not bigger government, freemen with freedom of enterprise and its intrinsic responsibilities and not the fist of excessive regulation and coercion.

We have achieved freedom in America. The conservative proposes to defend and maintain that freedom for our generation and those to follow. He is the true liberal of today.

PUBLIC LAND MORATORIUM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, as former chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have had more than a passing knowledge of the difficulties that have existed in the administration of the Bureau of Land Management under the land laws of the United States. The committee of which I was chairman prior to my election to the Senate has made a number of studies on this subject. Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL has continued those studies with the able assistance of Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho.

I was very pleased to see the forthright manner in which the new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, a former member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dealt with this vexing problem. It is unfortunate he was immediately criticized by some of my colleagues in a letter of February 25, and it was also unfortunate that some of the actions taken by Secretary Udall were apparently misunderstood.

In view of the publicity that was given to the criticism of Secretary Udall by my colleagues, I feel that in the interest of presenting both sides of the case I should call your attention to Secretary Udall's reply to them of February 28, a copy of which follows—and I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's reply be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SECRETARY UDALL ANSWERS CRITICS OF PUBLIC LAND MORATORIUM

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today released the text of a letter to Senators Barry Goldwater, Wallace F. Bennett, Henry Dworshak, and Gordon Allott replying to a joint letter from the four Senators protesting his order of February 14, 1961, establishing an 18-month moratorium on most types of nonmineral applications and petitions for public lands within the national land reserve administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The Secretary's letter rejects the Senators' request that the February 14 order be reconsidered or amended, and denies any intention to "freeze" public land programs. "The moratorium will have exactly the opposite effect," the Secretary said, "it will allow the Department to unfreeze public land programs that have been in a deep freeze for many years. The Department will substitute orderly business-like operations for the frozen morass of backlogs and rejected applications."

The moratorium, the Secretary asserted, will permit the Department to devote much more of its funds and resources to meeting important public needs. In addition, far less time will be devoted to unproductive inquiries and complaints about backlogged work.

The Secretary noted that the Senators were worried whether the moratorium would slow down or hinder pending private land exchanges to block out public and private ownerships. "Such exchanges will, in fact, be 'unfrozen' by the public-land conservation program which I announced on the same day. That program replaced and broadened an unworkable set of so-called antispeculation policies instituted by my predecessor, under which private exchanges came to a standstill," Secretary Udall said.

Secretary Udall accused the Senators of exhibiting a severe misunderstanding of the background giving rise to the moratorium, but offered to accept the Senator's offer to cooperate on public-land programs in the public interest. "This can be done through your active consideration, at the appropriate time, of legislative requests submitted by the Department. In the meanwhile, it is appropriate for strong and vigorous measures to be taken in the public interest within the executive branch."

A copy of the text of Secretary Udall's letter is attached.

TEXT OF IDENTICAL LETTERS TO SENATORS WALLACE F. BENNETT, HENRY DWORSHAK, BARRY GOLDWATER, AND GORDON ALLOTT

In your February 25 letter you joined three other Republican Senators in protesting my order of February 14 establishing an 18-month moratorium on most types of new applications for withdrawn nonmineral public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The moratorium was not hastily issued or ill advised. It will benefit many citizens, not only in the West but throughout the country. It will permit public land administration to be put on a sound business-like basis in keeping with the goals of President Kennedy's message to the Congress on natural resources and conservation.

It is worthy of note that your letter, joined in by three Republican colleagues, is the only objection I have received in the 2 weeks since the moratorium. It is also noteworthy that no similar protest has been received from Members of the House of Representatives. The Members of that body may be better informed on this subject, stemming from studies made in 1957 by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under former chairman, now Senator, CLAIR ENGLE of California, and continuing under Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado. The House of Representatives continued its studies of these public land problems in 1959 and 1960 at public hearings in the West and in Washington, D.C., under Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST of Idaho.

In a letter to me of February 23 Chairman ASPINALL again indicated his understanding of the problem and that he appreciated the overall merits of the approach to the problem we have taken.

Your letter reflects a thorough misunderstanding of the reasons for the moratorium and the effect it will have on the programs of the Department and the Bureau of Land Management. Time and time again your letter refers to a public land "freeze" and "no new starts" and to the stifling of development in the West. The moratorium will have exactly the opposite effect; it will allow the Department to unfreeze public land programs that have been in a deep freeze for many years. The Department will substitute orderly business-like operations for the frozen morass of backlogs and rejected applications.

The moratorium "freezes" nothing except the privilege of indiscriminately filing applications during the next 18 months on lands that are withdrawn from sale or entry. During the next 18 months public land disposition will be made through the orderly processing of applications already pending, and through positive actions to classify and open areas on the Government's own motion. Even now, many regularly scheduled sales of public lands for private recreation and residence are going ahead on schedule. In the meanwhile, further backlogs of new applications on withdrawn lands are not being permitted to accumulate.

The moratorium will also permit Department resource technicians to put a more equitable portion of their energies on constructive public use programs involving lands for public recreation, wildlife conservation, and the fulfillment of needs by Federal, State, and local government agencies. In addition, far less time will be devoted to unproductive inquiries and complaints about backlogged work.

You have asked why the moratorium applied only to land, whereas mineral cases and applications are also backlogged. The answer is that both types of work are done in the same offices. It is essential to free the offices from the overflow of land applications to permit essential mineral resource activities to be continued.

The existence of this serious—almost desperate—problem was recognized by former Secretary Fred A. Seaton. A report submitted to former President Eisenhower in August 1960, recognized "serious administrative problems," and stated: "A tremendous workload has resulted from this method of operation and many delays were incurred in the physical handling of individual transactions." The previous administration planned to convert the Bureau's lands program during a 5-year period (1961–65) into a "controlled operation." The natural resources program of President Kennedy permits no such delay in curbing this serious situation and making a "new start" on inventories of public lands and resources necessary to stabilize tenure status and provide for conservation.

In your letter you asked if the moratorium would hinder or delay pending private exchanges to block out public and private ownerships. The answer is an absolute "No." Such exchanges will, in fact, be "unfrozen" by the public land conservation program which I announced on the same day. That program replaced and broadened an unworkable set of so-called antispeculation policies instituted by my predecessor, under which private exchanges came to a standstill. Private exchanges will continue, both for applications already pending and on new ones desired by the Government. The new administration intends to give much more emphasis to this type of action to provide better patterns of management for both public and private lands.

Your letter also refers to the moratorium as a withdrawal and questions the authority of the Secretary to take such action. First, it was not a withdrawal of any lands from the operation of the land laws. No withdrawal was necessary, inasmuch as the lands were withdrawn by the Congress under the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 and by Executive orders of 1934 and 1935. I have been advised by my Solicitor that the action to temporarily suspend the privilege of submitting applications prior to classification and opening of withdrawn lands is within the general powers of the Secretary. Such action is in keeping with the laws delegating to the Secretary grave responsibilities and

high public trust for the proper administration of these lands.

In summary, your letter, I must frankly say, exhibits severe misunderstanding of the background giving rise to my constructive action and is a mistaken analysis of the implications and effect of the two orders of February 14 as they affect the administration of public lands. I trust this explanation will eliminate your doubts as to the wisdom of my action, and that you will not further press for modification or elimination of the moratorium until time has permitted its benefits to be felt.

Your request for statistics has been referred to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, who will supply you with such data as can be made readily available on the items you have listed.

I appreciate your offer to cooperate on any public land program that is in the public interest. This can be done through your active consideration at the appropriate time, of legislative requests submitted by the Department. In the meanwhile, it is appropriate for strong and vigorous measures to be taken in the public interest within the executive branch.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

HIGH WAGES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a good many Americans are understandably troubled by the unemployment which currently afflicts the national economy. Experts from all sectors have offered explanations for this troublesome condition, often dwelling upon an alleged failure on the part of the Federal Government to provide the necessary stimulation for a more rapidly expanding economy.

While it is impossible to deny the profound influence of Federal expenditures upon our Nation's economic growth, I have been disturbed by those who suggest that the entire blame must be laid at the door of the Federal Government. I have waited for some economist to come forth with an alternative explanation.

And to my great delight and surprise, one has. I say surprise because the gentleman to whom I refer is Mr. J. A. Livingston of the Washington Post. In last Sunday's edition of the Post, Mr. Livingston, the author of a weekly business column, asked these rhetorical questions:

Could unemployment be the unhappy counterpart of high wages? Do people with high pay, pay for it with unemployment?

These same questions have been asked by many who do not automatically look to the Federal Government for succor in time of need. Mr. Livingston goes on to speculate in his column about the possibility of a Government-labor-management committee, which would be able to bring about an era in which labor leaders accept gains for workers through greater efficiency, lower prices, and a wage dollar of greater purchasing power rather than through increased wages.

There is much meat in Mr. Livingston's column, meat, I might add, of a different grade than one sometimes finds in the Post. I recommend it highly to my colleagues.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the column entitled, "High Pay Linked to Jobless Rate" in the Sunday edition of the Washington Post on February 26, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

HIGH PAY LINKED TO JOBLESS RATE

(By J. A. Livingston)

Once upon a time there was a rich, powerful, industrious nation, whose economic well-being was envied by peoples throughout the world. As in all countries, inequalities prevailed, not only between the captains of industry and the workers, but among the workers themselves. For an hour of labor, some workers received more than $3 others less than $2.

Three broad classes of workers were in an elite over-$3-an-hour group—construction workers, bituminous coal miners, and steel workers. One day an economist, ruminating over some labor statistics, noticed this striking fact: The unemployment rate among these three types of workers was also highest in the nation—16 percent for construction, 13 percent for bituminous coal, and 14 percent for steel.

Vexatious questions passed through his mind. Could this be rough—really rough—economic justice? Could unemployment be the unhappy counterpart of high wages? Do people with high pay, pay for it with unemployment?

WAGES—80 TO 85 PERCENT OF COSTS

His eye idled further along the statistics. He noted that automobile workers, with 9 percent unemployment, were fifth highest in hourly wages. Could this be pure happenstance? After all, the national average for unemployment was about 6.8 percent of the labor force.

Pondering these imponderables, the ruminator recalled his early economic indoctrination. Wage and salary costs—all along the line from production of raw materials, the transport of them to workshops, processing them, and bringing a finished product to market—range from 80 to 85 percent of the retail price.

Were some workers pricing their skills out of the buying reach of other workers? Indeed, were workers pricing their skills too high for some employers? Was this a cause of chronic economic malaise in Detroit, in coal areas, in steel centers?

In the coal mines, for instance, a great labor leader pushed up the hourly pay so high, including fringe benefits, that for some mines economics became all too simple: Mechanize or die.

Many mines "died." Other mine owners mechanized. Output per miner rose. Simultaneously, idleness per miner rose. Out of the blessing of increased efficiency came the curse of human desuetude.

STEEL SUFFERS, TOO

In construction, too: As wages of carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers increase, homebuilders try to find ways to cut costs. Building blocks supplant bricks and the greater labor of bricklaying. Concrete is poured into moulds, replacing many masons and carpenters. Spray-painting takes the place of brush—and so on.

In steelmaking, itself, massive mechanical improvements require highly skilled but fewer workers. And the competition of materials—plastic, aluminum, copper—becomes more intense as steel prices increase.

The economist was distressed by another correlation. His country had the highest unemployment rate among industrial nations of the world. At the same time, its employers paid the highest wages and its workers enjoyed the highest standard of living.

Was this rough economic justice, too? Is his country exporting employment and importing unemployment? Are corporations investing abroad to hold markets there, because they no longer can export at competitive prices? Do they even import parts because of advantageous prices?

LOWER PRICES FOR BETTER LIVING

The economist wondered if a new frontier in labor relations were coming—an era in which both management and labor seek improved productivity; an era in which labor leaders accept gains for workers through greater efficiency, lower prices, and a wage dollar of greater purchasing power rather than through increased wages.

He wondered if a newly established Government-labor-management committee would be able to persuade management to moderate the stress of unemployment—through retraining and relocation of workers displaced by the invisible hand of unseen economic forces.

Heretofore, businessmen, fearing high taxes, have consistently opposed social legislation. Heretofore, businessmen have protected profits or cut losses—by early layoffs.

In exchange for labor's consent to riddance of featherbedding, etc., would management bear some of the burdens of technological adjustments? Neither management nor union leaders can be happy with the ups and downs of production in, say, autos.

Labor leaders can afford to swap wage demands for greater assurance of work stability—for economic security. The economist recalled the longshoreman in the western part of the country agreed to full-scale mechanization in exchange for payment by employers into a "technological retirement" fund.

Only in this way, he reflected, can costs be held down and men work at their greatest efficiency. Only thus will the Nation hold its share of the world markets. Only by being able to buy more of what one another produce, will workers create jobs for themselves.

The economist sadly observed that in this great country, in contrast with other countries, unemployment rose simultaneously with employment. This wasn't using manpower well. If high wages didn't create full employment, he wondered if a Government-labor-management try at lower prices might.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I would like to express Wyoming's sincere appreciation to Senator BRIDGES for his significant recognition of the fiscal responsibility of the State of Wyoming upon which he commented on Tuesday, February 28.

I apologize for not being present on the floor at the time of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire; however, the RECORD will indicate that the majority leader received unanimous consent of this body for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to hold its hearings during the session of the Senate that day and, as a member of that committee, I was present at the hearing on the wilderness bill.

The enrolled joint resolution of the Wyoming State Legislature spoken of by Senator BRIDGES is a restatement of section 2, article 16, of the constitution of the State of Wyoming, which provides:

No debt in excess of the taxes for the current year, shall in any manner be created in the State of Wyoming, unless the proposition to create such debt shall have been submitted to a vote of the people and by them approved; except to suppress insurrection or to provide for the public defense.

With this in mind as the criteria set by the framers of the constitution of the State of Wyoming, some of whom I was acquainted with as a small boy, our State has continued to operate on a sound fiscal basis throughout the last 71 years with the exception of a few years in the late twenties and very early thirties.

Governor Miller, elected in 1932 and taking office in 1933, set about to establish the sound fiscal policy which characterizes our State at the present time. This policy achieved the highest balance during the tenure of the late Senator Hunt, who was Governor of the State of Wyoming from 1942 through 1948, when he assumed his seat in this body.

At the time I was inaugurated as Governor of the State of Wyoming, in January of 1959, the general fund balance was $5,781,136.02. On the day I left Wyoming, in January of this year, to assume my seat in this body, the balance was $7,077,921.93. Hence, it is evident that sound fiscal policy is characteristic of the State whose population increased from 225,565 in 1930 to 330,066 in 1960, or an increase of 33⅓ percent in 30 years, during which time the humanitarian responsibilities evidenced by the National Government came into being and were extended through their present level, the State participation in these programs having at all times been met by the State legislature.

Therefore, it would appear that the performance of our great State might well be a guiding light to other States, as suggested by the able Senator from New Hampshire, for creating an awareness of the possibilities for fiscal soundness in government.

Again, let me express our appreciation for the recognition of the State of Wyoming by the distinguished Senator, and assure him that my colleague, Mr. McGEE, and I will convey his congratulations to the Wyoming State Legislature on one of our frequent trips to our home State.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Executive order issued yesterday by President Kennedy to establish a Peace Corps is being warmly and enthusiastically received. It appeals to the basic idealism of the American people—it has struck a responsive chord in their hearts. This is a bold and imaginative program in keeping with the President's philosophy of dedicated service on behalf of our country and the world at large as expressed in his inaugural address when he said,

My fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

As my colleagues know, I have been a consistent and determined advocate of the Peace Corps proposal. In the last Congress I introduced legislation to establish such a corps of dedicated and skilled Americans to work with people of other countries in helping them to attain a better and fuller life. And so the President's prompt action in setting this proposal into motion meant a great deal to me personally. I commend the President for this bold and idealistic action, and I feel that I can safely say that the Congress will lend its full support to this program and enthusiastically adopt legislation in this session to place the Peace Corps on a permanent basis.

The Peace Corps, as I see it, will bring threefold benefits. First, it will be a rewarding and ennobling experience to those who serve. Second, by helping to raise the living standards of people in many areas throughout the world, it will be a real contribution to peace and freedom, Third, this people-to-people program will bring greater understanding of the common bonds which unite all mankind and help to break down the fears, suspicions, and prejudices which too often exist between people of different countries.

I do not want to leave the impression that the Peace Corps is offered as a panacea for the ills of the world. It is not offered with this thought in mind. The Peace Corps in getting underway will have to learn by experimentation, by trial and error—we will learn by doing. It will be a relatively modest program, especially as compared to the vast sums being spent in the world today on armaments.

But this is a bold and exciting program that will appeal to the basic humanitarian spirit of Americans. I feel that we have largely failed in recent years to come forth with programs which do have such appeal. The enthusiastic response to the Peace Corps on the part of so many Americans from all over our great land proves that we Americans do sincerely want to contribute and work toward building a better world for all mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD the President's Executive order establishing the Peace Corps, his initial statement announcing the order and his message to the Congress on the Peace Corps. Also, articles from the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star, along with favorable editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post.

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

EXECUTIVE ORDER—ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PEACE CORPS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, MARCH 1, 1961

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Mutual Security Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 832, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1750 et. seq.), and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Establishment of the Peace Corps. The Secretary of State shall establish an agency in the Department of State which shall be known as the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps shall be headed by a Director.

SEC. 2. Functions of the Peace Corps. (a) The Peace Corps shall be responsible for the training and service abroad of men and women of the United States in new programs of assistance to nations and areas of the world, and in conjunction with or in support of existing economic assistance programs of the United States and of the United Nations and other international organizations.

(b) The Secretary of State shall delegate, or cause to be delegated, to the Director of the Peace Corps such of the functions under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, vested in the President and delegated to the Secretary, or vested in the Secretary, as the Secretary shall deem necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of the Peace Corps.

SEC. 3. Financing of the Peace Corps. The Secretary of State shall provide for the financing of the Peace Corps with funds available to the Secretary for the performance of functions under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

SEC. 4. Relation to Executive Order No. 10893. This order shall not be deemed to supersede or derogate from any provision of Executive Order No. 10893 of November 8, 1960, as amended, and any delegation made by or pursuant to this order shall, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, be deemed to be in addition to any delegation made by or pursuant to that order.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1961.*

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, MARCH 1, 1961

I have today signed an Executive order providing for the establishment of a Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis. I am also sending to Congress a message proposing authorization of a permanent Peace Corps. This Corps will be a pool of trained American men and women sent overseas by the U.S. Government or through private institutions and organizations to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower.

It is our hope to have 500 or more people in the field by the end of the year.

The initial reactions to the Peace Corps proposal are convincing proof that we have, in this country, an immense reservoir of such men and women—anxious to sacrifice their energies and time and toil to the cause of world peace and human progress.

In establishing our Peace Corps we intend to make full use of the resources and talents of private institutions and groups. Universities, voluntary agencies, labor unions and industry will be asked to share in this effort—contributing diverse sources of energy and imagination—making it clear that the responsibility for peace is the responsibility of our entire society.

We will only send abroad Americans who are wanted by the host country—who have a real job to do—and who are qualified to do that job. Programs will be developed with care, and after full negotiation, in order to make sure that the Peace Corps is wanted and will contribute to the welfare of other people. Our Peace Corps is not designed as an instrument of diplomacy or propaganda or ideological conflict. It is designed to permit our people to exercise more fully their responsibilities in the great common cause of world development.

Life in the Peace Corps will not be easy. There will be no salary and allowances will be at a level sufficient only to maintain health and meet basic needs. Men and women will be expected to work and live alongside the nationals of the country in which they are stationed—doing the same work, eating the same food, talking the same language.

But if the life will not be easy, it will be rich and satisfying. For every young American who participates in the Peace Corps—who works in a foreign land—will know that he or she is sharing in the great common task of bringing to man that decent way of life which is the foundation of freedom and a condition of peace.

SPECIAL MESSAGE ON THE PEACE CORPS TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 1, 1961

I recommend to the Congress the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps—a pool of trained American men and women sent overseas by the U.S. Government or through private organizations and institutions to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower.

I have today signed an Executive order establishing a Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis.

The temporary Peace Corps will be a source of information and experience to aid us in formulating more effective plans for a permanent organization. In addition, by starting the Peace Corps now we will be able to begin training young men and women for oversea duty this summer with the objective of placing them in oversea positions by late fall. This temporary Peace Corps is being established under existing authority in the Mutual Security Act and will be located in the Department of State. Its initial expenses will be paid from appropriations currently available for our foreign aid program.

Throughout the world the people of the newly developing nations are struggling for economic and social progress which reflects their deepest desires. Our own freedom, and the future of freedom around the world, depend, in a very real sense, on their ability to build growing and independent nations where men can live in dignity, liberated from the bonds of hunger, ignorance, and poverty.

One of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of this goal is the lack of trained men and women with the skill to teach the young and assist in the operation of development projects—men and women with the capacity to cope with the demands of swiftly evolving economies, and with the dedication to put that capacity to work in the villages, the mountains, the towns, and the factories of dozens of struggling nations.

The vast task of economic development urgently requires skilled people to do the work of the society—to help teach in the schools, construct development projects, demonstrate modern methods of sanitation in the villages, and perform a hundred other tasks calling for training and advanced knowledge.

To meet this urgent need for skilled manpower we are proposing the establishment of a Peace Corps—an organization which will recruit and train American volunteers, sending them abroad to work with the people of other nations.

This organization will differ from existing assistance programs in that its members will supplement technical advisers by offering the specific skills needed by developing nations if they are to put technical advice to work. They will help provide the skilled manpower necessary to carry out the development projects planned by the host governments, acting at a working level and serving at great personal sacrifice. There is little doubt that the number of those who wish to serve will be far greater than our capacity to absorb them.

The Peace Corps or some similar approach has been strongly advocated by Senator HUMPHREY, Representative REUSS and others in the Congress. It has received strong support from universities, voluntary agencies, student groups, labor unions and business and professional organizations.

Last session, the Congress authorized a study of these possibilities. Preliminary reports of this study show that the Peace Corps is feasible, needed, and wanted by many foreign countries.

Most heartening of all, the initial reaction to this proposal has been an enthusiastic response by student groups, professional organizations and private citizens everywhere—a convincing demonstration that we have in this country an immense reservoir of dedicated men and women willing to devote their energies and time and toil to the cause of world peace and human progress.

Among the specific programs to which Peace Corps members can contribute are: teaching in primary and secondary schools, especially as part of national English language teaching programs; participation in the worldwide program of malaria eradication; instruction and operation of public health and sanitation projects; aiding in village development through school construction and other programs; increasing rural agricultural productivity by assisting local farmers to use modern implements and techniques. The initial emphasis of these programs will be on teaching. Thus the Peace Corps members will be an effective means of implementing the development programs of the host countries—programs which our technical assistance operations have helped to formulate.

The Peace Corps will not be limited to the young, or to college graduates. All Americans who are qualified will be welcome to join this effort. But undoubtedly the corps will be made up primarily of young people as they complete their formal education.

Because one of the greatest resources of a free society is the strength and diversity of its private organizations and institutions much of the Peace Corps program will be carried out by these groups, financially assisted by the Federal Government.

Peace Corps personnel will be made available to developing nations in the following ways:

1. Through private voluntary agencies carrying on international assistance programs.

2. Through oversea programs of colleges and universities.

3. Through assistance programs of international agencies.

4. Through assistance programs of the U.S. Government.

5. Through new programs which the Peace Corps itself directly administers.

In the majority of cases the Peace Corps will assume the entire responsibility for recruitment, training and the development of oversea projects. In other cases it will make available a pool of trained applicants to private groups who are carrying out projects approved by the Peace Corps.

In the case of Peace Corps programs conducted through voluntary agencies and universities, these private institutions will have the option of using the national recruitment system—the central pool of trained manpower—or developing recruitment systems of their own.

In all cases men and women recruited as a result of Federal assistance will be members of the Peace Corps and enrolled in the central organization. All private recruitment and training programs will adhere to Peace Corps standards as a condition of Federal assistance.

In all instances the men and women of the Peace Corps will go only to those countries where their services and skills are genuinely needed and desired. U.S. Operations Missions, supplemented where necessary by special Peace Corps teams, will consult with leaders in foreign countries in order to determine where Peace Corpsmen are needed, the types of job they can best fill, and the number of people who can be usefully employed. The Peace Corps will not supply personnel for marginal undertakings without a sound economic or social justification. In furnishing assistance through the Peace Corps careful regard will be given to the particular country's developmental priorities.

Membership in the Peace Corps will be open to all Americans, and applications will be available shortly. Where application is made directly to the Peace Corps—the vast majority of cases—they will be carefully screened to make sure that those who are selected can contribute to Peace Corps programs, and have the personal qualities which will enable them to represent the United States abroad with honor and dignity. In those cases where application is made directly to a private group, the same basic standards will be maintained. Each new recruit will receive a training and orientation period varying from 6 weeks to 6 months. This training will include courses in the culture and language of the country to which they are being sent and specialized training designed to increase the work skills of recruits. In some cases training will be conducted by participant agencies and universities in approved training programs. Other training programs will be conducted by the Peace Corps staff.

Length of service in the corps will vary depending on the kind of project and the country, generally ranging from 2 to 3 years. Peace Corps members will often serve under conditions of physical hardship, living under primitive conditions among the people of developing nations. For every Peace Corps member service will mean a great financial sacrifice. They will receive no salary. Instead they will be given an allowance which will only be sufficient to meet their basic needs and maintain health. It is essential that Peace Corps men and women live simply and unostentatiously among the people they have come to assist. At the conclusion of their tours, members of the Peace Corps will receive a small sum in the form of severance pay based on length of service abroad, to assist them during their first weeks back in the United States. Service with the Peace Corps will not exempt volunteers from selective service.

The United States will assume responsibility for supplying medical services to Peace Corps members and ensuring supplies and drugs necessary to good health.

I have asked the temporary Peace Corps to begin plans and make arrangements for pilot programs. A minimum of several hundred volunteers could be selected, trained and at work abroad by the end of this calendar year. It is hoped that within a few years several thousand Peace Corps members will be working in foreign lands.

It is important to remember that this program must, in its early stages, be experimental in nature. This is a new dimension in our oversea program and only the most careful planning and negotiation can insure its success.

The benefits of the Peace Corps will not be limited to the countries in which it serves. Our own young men and women will be enriched by the experience of living and working in foreign lands. They will have acquired new skills and experience which will aid them in their future careers and add to our own country's supply of trained personnel and teachers. They will return better able to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship and with greater understanding of our global responsibilities.

Although this is an American Peace Corps, the problem of world development is not just an American problem. Let us hope that other nations will mobilize the spirit and energies and skills of their people in some form of Peace Corps—making our own effort only one step in a major international effort to increase the welfare of all men and improve understanding among nations.

KENNEDY SETS UP U.S. PEACE CORPS TO WORK ABROAD—CREATES PILOT PLAN AND ASKS CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT OPERATION—RECRUITS TO GET NO PAY—PRESIDENT AIMS TO HAVE 500 ON JOB BY THE END OF 1961—TRAINING WILL BE PUSHED

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—President Kennedy issued an Executive order today creating

a Peace Corps. It will enlist American men and women for voluntary, unpaid service in the developing countries of the world.

The order set up the Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis. President Kennedy also sent Congress a message requesting legislation to make the corps permanent.

Announcing the move at his news conference, the President described the Peace Corps as a pool of trained American men and women sent overseas by the United States Government or through private organizations and institutions to help foreign governments meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower.

The President's expressed hope was to have 500 to 1,000 Peace Corps workers "in the field by the end of this year."

SHRIVER HEADS PLANNERS

The administration's planning effort on the Peace Corps has been headed since late January by R. Sargent Shriver, a Chicago businessman and civic leader who is the President's brother-in-law. The President said today that a decision on who would head the agency would be made in several days.

Life in the Peace Corps, the President stressed, will not be easy. Members will work without pay but they will be given living allowances. They will live at the same level as the inhabitants of the countries to which they are sent.

The President emphasized that "we will send Americans abroad who are qualified to do a job," particularly those with technical skills in teaching, agriculture and health.

"There is little doubt," the President said in his subsequent message to Congress, "that the number of those who wish to serve will be far greater than our capacity to absorb them."

"The Peace Corps," the President said in his message, "will not be limited to the young or to college graduates. All Americans who are qualified will be welcome to join this effort. But undoubtedly the corps will be made up primarily of young people as they complete their formal education."

President Kennedy first broached his version of the Peace Corps idea in a campaign speech at San Francisco last November 2. Previously, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, and Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, among others, had advocated such a plan.

In his San Francisco speech, Mr. Kennedy suggested that membership in the Peace Corps could be an alternative to the military draft.

In a subsequent task-force report, Dr. Max Millikan, director of the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said he thought there would be sufficient volunteers "without the bait of freedom from the draft."

Today President Kennedy said in his message that there would be no draft exemptions for members of the Peace Corps.

White House aids said that as a practical matter, draft boards would probably grant deferments to members of the Peace Corps. Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, recently said that with the small number of men currently being drafted, most members of such a corps would in effect, be exempted.

Reaction to the President's proposal was generally favorable on Capitol Hill.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, assistant Democratic leader in the Senate, applauded the President's announcement as a "dream come true." Long an advocate of such an organization, he said he would offer a bill soon to make the corps permanent.

White House spokesmen outlined the Peace Corps operation as follows:

The initial cost through the end of the fiscal year ending June 30 will be paid out of foreign aid funds that have already been appropriated.

For the following years, a special appropriation will be required from Congress. The cost for a worker a year is estimated at $5,000 to $12,000—including training, transportation, living allowances, medical care and administrative overhead. Thus, with 2,000 workers overseas, the annual cost would be $10 million to $24 million.

Men and women in the corps will serve essentially as teachers and field technicians in United States technical assistance programs. They will work in the fields of education, farm techniques, public health, home crafts and English-language instruction. They will operate at the invitation of host countries, and largely under native authorities.

PEACE CORPS IS SET UP BY PRESIDENT'S ORDER—PILOT FORCE PLANNED, BUT CONGRESS IS ASKED FOR PERMANENT STATUS LATER

(By Cecil Holland)

President Kennedy by Executive order today established a Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis and sent to Congress a message proposing a permanent organization.

"This corps will be a pool of plain American men and women sent overseas by the U.S. Government or through private institutions and organizations to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower," the President said.

He announced the double-barreled action to set up the Peace Corps at his news conference and said it is hoped to have 500 to 1,000 people in the field by the end of the year.

SHARE COMMON TASK

"Life in the Peace Corps will not be easy," the President emphasized. "There will be no salary and allowances will be at a level sufficient only to maintain health and meet basic needs. Men and women will be expected to work and live alongside the nationals of the country in which they are stationed—doing the same work, eating the same food, talking the same language.

"But if the life will not be easy, it will be rich and satisfying. For every American who participates in the Peace Corps—who works in a foreign land—will know that he or she is sharing the great common task of bringing to man that decent way of life which is the foundation of freedom and a condition of peace."

The President suggested the idea of a Peace Corps to use the services of trained young men and women overseas during the presidential campaign. Since he took office his brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver, has been working on a voluntary basis in setting up preliminary plans for the organization.

Asked if Mr. Shriver, who is a top official of the Merchandise Mart in Chicago, would be named as head of the Peace Corps, the President said no determination has yet been made on the director and staff.

Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, assistant Democratic leader of the Senate, hailed the President's action in these words:

"The President's Executive order for a Peace Corps marks the beginning of one of the most dramatic international programs by the United States since the end of World War II. For me, this is a dream come true.

"The Peace Corps must be established on a permanent basis, and expanded. I will introduce legislation in the Senate soon to authorize a continuing program. I have no doubt that the initial stage of the Peace Corps program by the President will succeed."

Under the President's Executive order, the pilot organization will be financed out of mutual security funds.

SERVICE TO VARY

Length of service in the corps, the President said, will vary, depending on the kind of project and the country but generally will range from 2 to 3 years. At the conclusion of their tours, the President said, members of the corps will receive a small sum in severance pay based on their length of service abroad to assist them during their first weeks back in the United States.

Service with the Peace Corps, the President said will not exempt members from selective service.

Neither at his press conference nor in his special message did Mr. Kennedy give any figures on the cost of the pilot program or what the Peace Corps would cost on a permanent basis.

In his press conference statement the President said the Peace Corps will make full use of the resources and talents of private institutions and groups. He said the initial reactions to his proposal have provided "convincing proof that we have, in this country, an immense reservoir of such men and women—anxious to sacrifice their energies and time and toil to the cause of world peace and human progress."

The President said the Peace Corps will only send abroad Americans who are wanted by the host country and who are qualified to do the job for which they are sent.

"Our Peace Corps is not designed as an instrument of diplomacy or propaganda or ideological conflict," the President continued. "It is designed to permit our people to exercise more fully their responsibilities in the great common cause of world development."

In his message to Congress, the President said one of the greatest obstacles in newly developing nations was the lack of trained men and women with the skills to teach the young and assist in the operation of development projects. The Peace Corps, the President said, will meet "this urgent need for skilled manpower."

He said the corps will not be limited to the young or to college graduates.

"All Americans who are qualified will be welcome to join in this effort," he added. "But undoubtedly the corps will be made up primarily of young people as they complete their formal education."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1961]

PRESIDENT SETS UP PEACE CORPS, OPEN TO ALL AGES WITHOUT WAGES

(By Julius Duscha)

President Kennedy established a Peace Corps yesterday which will be open to Americans of all ages.

Nearly all of the members are expected, however, to be from 21 to 30 years old.

The President told his press conference that he hopes to have 500 to 1,000 members of the corps serving abroad by the end of the year.

The first recruits will be put to work teaching English, helping farmers to increase their yields and assisting villages in the development of sanitary water and sewer systems.

PILOT PROJECTS

Under present plans, pilot Peace Corps projects will be established within 6 months in an Asian, an African and a Latin American country.

The program will be administered by the State Department with funds voted by Congress for foreign aid.

Mr. Kennedy said that applications for membership in the corps will be available shortly. They probably will be distributed largely through colleges and universities.

The President issued an Executive order setting up the corps on a temporary basis and then asked Congress to pass legislation placing the program on a permanent basis.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR DRAFT

The Peace Corps idea, first suggested by Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, Wisconsin, 4 years ago, was advocated by Mr. Kennedy during the campaign last fall.

However, membership in the corps will not be a substitute for selective service, as suggested by Mr. Kennedy last fall. Nor will membership be restricted to young men and women, as the President had also proposed.

The physical requirements and financial sacrifices of members will be such, however, that few persons over 30 are expected to be interested in serving overseas for the 2 to 3 years that will be asked of corps members.

MUST MEET PHYSICAL TESTS

Nevertheless, if an idealistic person of, say, 40 wants to be in the corps he could be accepted, providing he meets the physical tests and has the skills that are needed abroad.

The age limit was left open in part to meet objections from some critics of the corps that older persons with experience, such as county agricultural agents, frequently are more useful in underdeveloped countries than inexperienced but energetic youths.

The corps is envisioned as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, the expert assistance which the United States has been providing to underdeveloped countries for more than 10 years.

RUGGED LIFE

"Life in the Peace Corps will not be easy," the President said. "There will be no salary, and allowances will be at a level sufficient only to maintain health and meet basic needs.

"Men and women," he added, "will be expected to work and live alongside the nationals of the country in which they are stationed—doing the same work, eating the same food, talking the same language."

Many of the members of the corps, which the President said would eventually include several thousand persons, will work for voluntary and educational agencies carrying on programs abroad.

TRAINEE POOL PLANNED

Some of the members will be trained by these agencies and institutions rather than by the Government, but the State Department, the President added, will make available "a pool of trained applicants" to private groups.

Mr. Kennedy said that training programs for corps members would last from 6 weeks to 6 months.

Plans for the program were drawn up by R. Sargent Schriver, a brother-in-law and adviser of the President. Mr. Kennedy said, however, that it has not yet been decided whether Schriver will administer the program.

No cost estimates were made by the President. Persons who have been working with Schriver have calculated, however, that the program would cost $5,000 a year for each corps member. This figure includes all administrative costs.

Thus, a 1,000-member program would cost $5 million a year, a 10,000-member corps $50 million.

VOLUNTEERS RUSH TO JOIN NEW CORPS—RAFER JOHNSON AMONG THOSE WHO WANT TO SERVE

(By David Halberstam)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Rafer Johnson, the Olympic decathlon champion, has volunteered to join the Peace Corps announced today by President Kennedy.

Forrest Evashevski, former football coach at the University of Iowa and once a noted blocking back at the University of Michigan, will soon take a job at the headquarters of the corps in Washington.

Sally Bowles, daughter of Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, and Nancy Gore, daughter of Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee, are already at work at corps headquarters.

Today, within an hour or two after President Kennedy had announced the establishment of the Peace Corps on a pilot basis, the switchboard at headquarters could not handle the calls from volunteers and inquirers.

The response to the idea of a voluntary organization in which American men and women could help the developing countries of the world has exceeded all expectations.

President Kennedy is reported to have received more letters about the Peace Corps than about any other issue—some 6,000 letters of suggestion, inquiry, and open application. None mentions salary. "And not only do we get letters from young people who want to serve," said Ed Babley, who is temporarily the public relations officer for the corps, "I am amazed at the requests we have from older people who want to work on the Washington staff—lawyers, newspapermen, businessmen.

"And for the young people—why this is a chance to participate directly in a government which always seems so far away and distant."

Some of the headquarters staff members, such as Miss Gore, are not sure yet what they are being paid—and if they are being paid.

Miss Gore said she chose the Peace Corps because:

"It's the first new idea of the New Frontier. It's one of the few original things that's happened in a long time, and it's one that I can participate in, something that I can contribute to."

Miss Bowles said joining the staff of the Peace Corps "is exactly what I wanted to do—I feel very strongly about this and have ever since I was in India." She was there when her father was Ambassador to India. There, she said, she saw the potential for a group of dedicated young people.

Another young staff member, Miss Mitzi Mallina of Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y., said the idea of the Peace Corps had deeply touched today's college seniors.

"I know a lot of boys at Harvard and MIT who have been waiting to hear the news about it—who have been hoping it would open up soon enough so that they could join when they got out of college," she said.

The letters are indicative too:

From Hartsville, Ohio: "I could couple my knowledge of agriculture with a speaking knowledge of Spanish and work in Latin America."

From New York City: "I am willing to spend the rest of my life in work like this because it can mean so much to our country."

From Cleveland: "Have you a place for me in your fight for peace?"

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1961]

THE PEACE CORPS STARTS

Following extensive preliminary studies and an enthusiastic response at home and abroad, President Kennedy has started what is surely one of the most remarkable projects ever undertaken by any nation. It calls for creation of a voluntary Peace Corps of idealistic, dedicated and self-sacrificing young American men and women who will serve overseas without pay and under arduous conditions to help underdeveloped countries attain a better and fuller life as a contribution to the cause of peace and human progress.

Such a corps was pledged by Mr. Kennedy during his campaign and is part of the program indicated in his inaugural address in which he sounded a trumpet call for a long struggle "against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself." Now he has issued an Executive order for its establishment on a temporary pilot basis and has sent a special message to Congress urging that it be made permanent.

This Peace Corps is to constitute a pool of trained men and women, in particular, teachers, agricultural experts and health specialists, organized under the State Department. They will work through Government aid programs, international aid agencies and private aid organizations and are to be made available to public or private agencies in underdeveloped countries seeking their aid. Recruiting will begin soon and Mr. Kennedy hopes to have some 500 in the field by the end of the year.

There are to be no "Ugly Americans" among them, nor will they come like Communist agents by stealth and subterfuge. They will be expected not only to go without pay, except for an allowance for basic needs, but also to live the life of the people they are to assist, doing the same work, eating the same food, talking the same language. And they will not be exempted from the draft. But they are not to become instruments of propaganda or ideological conflict, except, of course, insofar as their aid and bearing give testimony of our ideals and purposes.

This is a noble enterprise, not without risks and pitfalls, to which all men of good will can only wish a resounding success.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1961]

SKILLS FOR PEACE

One of the most exciting ideas embraced by the Kennedy administration is that of the Peace Corps—a group of young Americans working and living with other peoples to help teach and train them for a better life. President Kennedy's Executive order establishing the Peace Corps on a temporary pilot basis, and his message to Congress recommending permanent legislation, buttress the concept originally suggested by Senator HUMPHREY, Representative REUSS and others.

This will be no lark for dilettantes. Mr. Kennedy proposes that members of the Peace Corps live in accordance with local standards, that they be furnished an allowance and medical care but draw no salary. They will not be exempt from Selective Service. Mr. Kennedy hopes to have 500 such men and women in the field by the end of the year, each trained intensively in local cultures and languages as well as in particular skills.

Happily, the framework envisaged for the Peace Corps is highly flexible. Members can be drawn from a large number of sources—voluntary agencies, universities, industry, labor and the like. They will be trained to assist in teaching programs, particularly the teaching of English, in sanitation demonstrations, improvement of rural productivity and similar projects. They may be used in private as well as governmental programs abroad, including programs of the United Nations. The possibilities for useful activity are thus very broad. Doubtless there will be opportunity for members of the Peace Corps to assist in the food-for-peace program, for example, when the expanded effort takes shape.

It is well to keep the Peace Corps a modest undertaking, especially at the beginning. Quality will be far more important than quantity; the measure of the worth of the corps will be in the good work it accomplishes rather than in the thousands of people involved. Obviously programs should be initiated only where they are wanted; obviously, too, great care must be taken in the selection and training of applicants. Nothing is more defeating of true U.S. objectives in helping other countries than the caricatures, lamentably sometimes based on fact, of Americans living it up and lording it over the "locals."

Within such limitations and with the guidance of practical experience in unostentatious performance, however, the Peace Corps will offer an outlet for Americans to assert their basic humanitarian impulses in a uniquely fruitful and rewarding manner. They will, as President Kennedy noted, "be enriched by the experience of living and

working in foreign lands." More important, they will be "sharing in the great common task of bringing to man that decent way of life which is the foundation of freedom and a condition of peace."

PROGRESS AT THE EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is encouraging to receive reports of the progress being made in establishing the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center in Hawaii. As Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has repeatedly pointed out, this undertaking has virtually unlimited possibilities as an instrument of peace and security. In order to inform the Members of the Senate of the status of this important project, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "East-West Center Busy—and Building," published in the Honolulu Advertiser of February 27, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EAST-WEST CENTER BUSY—AND BUILDING

(By Joanne Braunberns)

The East-West Center is going full blast at the University of Hawaii.

Here are some examples:

One hundred and one students already are studying here on center scholarships.

The many programs, such as the Institute of Advanced Projects, have begun.

Bids for physical facilities will be let by June.

Acting directors fill all the administrative positions and make decisions necessary to keep the center operating on schedule.

Thus, while a permanent director has not yet been selected, the center is in operation.

Search for the top man has been underway for some time. During the weekend university officials said appointment of the permanent director will be one of the first items of business for the new board of regents.

An informed source reported that the post has been offered to Walter H. C. Laves, chairman of the department of government at Indiana University. He is expected here soon for an interview.

The naming of others to permanent positions is expected to follow in rapid order.

More than 1,000 inquiries about the the East-West Center have been received from the United States alone. Many, many more have come from Asian countries.

Of the 101 scholarship students on campus now, all but 9 are from Asia. A large number of them are studying how to teach English when they return to their native lands.

Others are delving into botany, soil science, history, business administration and economics as their major interests. Popular, too, are the fields of education, government and public administration, for the students are interested in American techniques.

Regarding various center programs, the Institute of Advanced Projects is a good example. Enrolled and at work gathering data for three books on China is Dr. Franklin L. Ho.

Born in China, he rose to prominence as an international economist. Dr. Ho is a professor emeritus from Columbia University, now the center's first senior scholar.

The first two of his planned books will furnish background for the third on Communist China.

Under the guidance of acting directors, other programs are underway, too.

Construction of the first center buildings will begin this year as bids must be let before the end of June. There is money for two dormitories (one high, one low), a theater-auditorium, an administration and food services building, and a classroom-laboratory structure.

Soil tests have been completed and approval given to the exact site location of the buildings. The center facilities will be along Manoa Stream in the diamond head, mauka section of the campus.

A contract for an access road and underground utilities already has been let to Hawaiian Dredging and Construction Co. for $315,008.

A staff of 14 full-time and 16 part-time workers, headed by Murray Turnbull as acting director, are keeping the East-West Center program rolling.

Most of them are doing business at Hale Aloha, recently vacated by the School of Nursing.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO COMMEMORATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1ST INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–1, he has appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee To Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the 1st Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

WIRETAP LEGISLATION STRONGLY URGED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Tuesday I introduced a bill (S. 1086) to remove the present cloud over State regulation of wiretapping under court order. This bill was modeled after S. 3340 in the 86th Congress which was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Several strong endorsements of such legislation have come to my attention. I know that these statements will be of interest to many Members who share my concern with the present illogical and dangerous situation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Evening Star and a letter from Frank D. O'Connor, the distinguished president of the New York State District Attorneys Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 1, 1961]

FOG OVER WIRETAPPING HELPS THE CRIMINALS

The Supreme Court, by 7–2 vote, says it is all right for the State of New York to use wiretap evidence in criminal cases.

This, of course, is of some practical assistance to law enforcement, but it still fails to resolve the basic confusion.

For despite what the Highest Tribunal ruled on Monday, the existing situation is that the 1934 Federal Communications Act prohibits wiretapping and divulgence of what is heard. So that which is permitted in New York and several other States under careful guardianship as an instrument to catch criminals is nevertheless a violation of Federal law.

True, no State official has ever been prosecuted, and indeed the Supreme Court has yet to declare outright that wiretapping itself is a crime, although even the divulgence of the existence of a wiretap has been found to be a crime. And the use of a wiretap evidence has long been forbidden in Federal courts.

It's helpful for the Supreme Court to rule that the State courts are not equally bound, and yet it is a prize bafflement that the divulgence of such evidence comprises a crime.

The fact is that wiretapping in New York, by law officers and under specified safeguards, has served well against wrongdoers. It is doubtful that Congress, back in 1934, had any thought that section 605, which is the root of all the present controversy, would ever boomerang on the district attorney. Certainly this could not have been the lawmakers' intent.

But now we have the anomaly where the prosecutors of crime are on one hand effectively using the wiretap to enforce the law (and, let it be noted, without violating anybody's liberties), while simultaneously this appears as disrespect of law.

It makes no sense.

What would make sense, however, would be for Congress to legalize wiretapping by the States in the best interest of law enforcement. This, as already proposed in the Keating-Celler bill last year, would back up the New York law and clear the confusion. Otherwise fuzzy old section 605 will only continue to serve the criminals.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1961]

WIRETAP MUDDLE

The latest Supreme Court ruling in a wiretap case preserves the right of a State to use wiretap evidence in a criminal case in a State court. But the arguments advanced in the dissenting opinion and the contentions of counsel for the accused man demonstrates again the need for clarification by Congress of its intent in adopting the 1934 ban on wiretapping.

The case before the court involved a man facing trial in New York for alleged complicity in the acid blinding of his girl friend. He said the evidence against him had been obtained by tapping his telephone, and he wanted the Supreme Court to forbid the State to use this evidence at the trial. The dissenting judges said, with a touch of sarcasm, that the majority ruling leaves the accused "only with the consoling knowledge that Congress meant to protect the privacy of his telephone conversations, while the benefits of the congressional intendment are denied him." This is equivalent to saying that in any criminal case resting wholly on wiretap evidence, Congress intended to safeguard the privacy of the criminal's telephone even though the result is to free the criminal.

On the day this opinion came down the police caught a man identified as the degenerate murderer of a 4-year-old New York girl. The evidence against him is not based on wiretaps. But suppose it were—let's assume that this man had been caught solely as a result of tapping his telephone. Is it the intent of Congress that the only evidence against him, that from the wiretap, could not be used, and that he would have to be turned loose? Our guess is that nothing was further from the congressional mind when the 1934 law was enacted.

The fact is, however, that this would have been precisely the result had the case come before a Federal court, and we think action by Congress to clarify the law is long overdue. There will always be those who cry that wiretapping is a dirty business. But so is the murder of little children and the blinding of people by acid throwers. Wiretapping, under appropriate safeguards, ought to be made a legitimate and usable tool in law enforcement.

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
OF QUEENS COUNTY,
Long Island City, N.Y., February 28, 1961.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As the newly elected president of the New York State District Attorneys Association, I wish to take this occasion to commend you most highly for the splendid efforts you have expended in the past in connection with the so-called wiretapping legislation. Although we all welcome the decision of the Supreme Court in the Pugach case as being a step in the right direction, the need for Federal legislation authorizing New York State law enforcement officials to proceed according to State law is more urgent than ever.

Therefore, speaking on behalf of the 62 district attorneys of the State of New York and, in the name of good criminal law enforcement, I again commend you for your very worthwhile efforts and express our wholehearted support of the provisions of your bill No. 3340.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
FRANK D. O'CONNOR,
President, New York State District Attorneys Association.

U.S. TRADE CENTER TO BE OPENED IN LONDON

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this coming June a U.S. Trade Center is to be opened in London as a showcase for American goods in Europe. The center is one of a number of important steps recently taken by the Department of Commerce to encourage and expand exports and thereby help to relieve our Nation's present international balance of payments difficulties.

Mr. President, this is an excellent and constructive step. Many nations, in their efforts to encourage and promote international trade, have already set up exhibits in the United States and throughout the world. It is about time that we followed their example, and I am happy that efforts are going forward to do so.

The exhibits at London will display a wide variety of American products which should be of interest in Britain. Many of the firms participating have never sold products in Britain before, and it is hoped that these firms and, in fact, all of the firms exhibiting will expand their sales abroad as a result.

I am happy to announce that 18 of the 50 firms exhibiting in London are located in New York State. These firms have worked closely with the U.S. Department of Commerce and with the New York Department of Commerce in making arrangements for their exhibits in London. I hope that the London show will be a success, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 18 New York firms I have mentioned appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

Adirondack Bowles, Inc., Auburn, N.Y.
Corning Glass International, New York, N.Y.
Drezo Manufacturing Corp., Bronx, N.Y.
S. W. Farber, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Frigid, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Garner & Co., New York, N.Y.
General Slicing Machine Co., Inc., Walden, N.Y.
Hunter Metal Industries, Inc., Patchogue, L.I., N.Y.
Modern Spacemaster Products, Inc., Great Neck, N.Y.
Paulben Industries, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Poloron Products, Inc., New Rochelle, N.Y.
Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., Rome, N.Y.
Synthetic Fabrics, Inc., New York, N.Y.
The Ullman Co., Inc., Brooklyn 6, N.Y.
Wear-Ever Aluminum, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Westchester Brickote Products Co., New York, N.Y.
Westinghouse International, New York, N.Y.
Joell Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.

ALASKA—BULWARK OF DEFENSE FOR THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTINENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the late and great Billy Mitchell, prophet of the importance of airpower in war, likewise uttered a great and prophetic dictum about Alaska and its strategic importance. For many years, Billy Mitchell's wisdom about Alaska was ignored, just as his wise prescience about airpower, at the time of its utterance, was treated with contempt by the Army and Navy high commands. Only when the war clouds were actually looming, on the eve of World War II, that the belated appreciation, and still an inadequate one, of the importance of Alaska as the bulwark of defense for the North American Continent dawned upon our Federal authorities.

It had been repeatedly called to their attention by Alaskans, notably by the late and great Anthony J. Dimond, who was Alaska's Delegate in Congress from 1933 to 1945. But the voice of a voteless Delegate—which was all that Alaska had to represent it at that time—did not register very heavily. And so, in consequence of the disregard of Tony Dimond's repeated warnings, Alaska was the only area in North America, a part of which was invaded and for a time held by the enemy. Though this enemy was finally expelled, the whole costly Aleutian campaign, with its loss of lives, could have been avoided had the proper defensive measures been taken as Tony Dimond and others of us had urged.

A year ago, the people of Alaska were profoundly shocked at the move of the U.S. Air Force in withdrawing its fighter planes from Ladd Field, our northernmost airbase, and following it, within a few weeks, with a complete closure of Ladd Field. Our Alaska delegation felt then, and feels now, that this was a great mistake. We did not share the view of some of the military authorities who had made this decision, that the airplane was obsolescent and almost obsolete, and that the advent of missiles had changed the picture overnight. And overnight indeed was the Air Force change of posture and policy, since its warehouses in Alaska were filled with the parts of the F–101 fighter plane which it had suddenly canceled out.

From the economic standpoint, however, Alaska was not the loser, since the Army, sensing the great importance of training in Arctic warfare, felt sufficiently justified in moving into the Ladd base which the Air Force was vacating renaming it Fort Jonathan Wainwright. Great credit for this enlightened move is due to Maj. Gen. John H. Michaelis, the dynamic and able Army commander in Alaska who is well known to us on the Hill because of his previous work as a liaison officer between the Army and the Congress.

Our delegation likewise feels that the plea made 2 years ago by the commander in chief of the Alaskan Command, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, who in previous years had served in Alaska as a commander of the Air Forces there, that missile bases be established in Alaska was fully justified.

When the present administration has had a chance to conclude its restudy of our defense needs, I earnestly hope that the importance of Alaska to our national defense and potential offense will again be appreciated, for it is clear that with the rapidly changing world events the bases that we have established around the world are far from secure. We have been forced to abandon our very costly bases in Morocco. Other U.S. bases are similarly in jeopardy because of rising nationalism, subversion and other factors. But what we build in Alaska is built on the solid rock of national terrain amid a 100 percent militantly patriotic and loyal American citizenry. Alaska is not only the natural bulwark of defense for the North American Continent but indeed for the Western World. It is also, however, a great reservoir of economic strength. It has the largest undeveloped hydroelectric potential under the flag. Alaska's Rampart Dam to harness the waters of the mighty Yukon will produce the cheapest power in the Western World and revolutionize the economy of Alaska to the benefit not merely of our State, but of the Nation.

Both the subjects of defense and economic development were treated in an excellent address made recently by Col. Christian Hanburger, the able district engineer in Alaska of the Corps of Engineers before the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce. Colonel Hanburger points out that Rampart could be producing power for industry in a decade, if full authorization and funding are forthcoming, and that its two-mill power at the bus bar can be transmitted to Alaska tidewater at the low cost of 3 mills. As we know, President Kennedy has endorsed this project and it is in line with his constructive resource development policy which was voiced in his recent message to Congress as well as in the pronouncements of Secretary of the Interior Udall.

I ask unanimous consent that Colonel Hanburger's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY COL. CHRISTIAN HANBURGER

I would like to review with you today something of what has been accomplished in military defense construction in Alaska during the last 20 years, and then briefly to glance to the future.

The military construction program has been an important factor in Alaska's phenomenal growth. It very likely has affected every person—resident of Alaska—during the 20-year period, either directly or indirectly.

Dating back to 1946, this program has been administered by the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, the organization that I represent. The district was created to continue the work started in Alaska by Engineer troops in 1941. Both are elements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Engineers in uniform began the construction in the months preceding an attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. After war was declared, the work was expanded in scope and increased in tempo. Their mission was to build facilities needed for defense and offense.

In this they were singularly successful. They built the Alcan Highway, forerunner of the Alaska Highway, and numerous bases from Annette Island to Nome and from Nome to Attu. These rightfully have been called stepping stones to victory.

Following the war, the construction mission inherited by the district was modified to fit the world situation. The Alaska District continued to build or adapt facilities for defense, but not for the offensive. These were needed by a nation at peace, which at the same time was engaged in a cold war.

The first work undertaken by the Alaska District in 1946 was at Anchorage and Fairbanks where wartime bases were converted to modern, permanent installations. Afterward, a network of defense warning stations and secondary bases were established radiating out from these centers to the most remote corners of this large State.

This work of the first 20 years has been successful. Most of the defense work I described has been done. We have work remaining to do, but the spadework is done.

More was achieved in this period than the mere building of a defense network, no matter how vast or intricate in a frontier country. It was during these years that Alaska experienced an unprecedented period of growth—a growth that I am sure will continue. The presence of a large civilian construction industry numbering over 2,300 at peak periods certainly has been a factor in Alaska's growth of the last 20 years.

This defense program will continue as the needs of the Nation dictate, and it will continue to contribute to Alaska's economy in the future; but not, barring the totally unforeseen, on a scale that it did in the past 20 years.

The hard, costly pioneer work has been done. The remote stations have been built. The large jobs, Clear being the latest, have been virtually completed.

Projects starting this year are perhaps as varied in design as they were in the past, but they are smaller and they are not as difficult of access.

They include the relocation of an alert hangar, runway work, chapel construction, an airmen's dormitory, radar tower work, construction of runway extensions, building of a drycleaning facility, and family quarters.

In the Anchorage area we will start building a storage cubicle magazine, a missile assembly shop, taxiway lighting, and utilities at Elmendorf.

The estimated value of work that we expect to place this year is $27 million. For last year, this was $95 million, or slightly more than three times as much as this year.

Last year was one of the big years in military construction in Alaska. It ranks with the annual programs undertaken in the period from 1950 to 1959. It was during the fifties that military construction reached its peak. In 1953, the value of placement peaked out at $150 million. The average annual placement was $96 million. The program is down noticeably from its peak.

In the 20 years of military construction, a total of slightly more than $2 billion was spent in Alaska. Such a sum would be helpful in any economy, no matter how rich it was otherwise.

The question will arise now as to what the effects will be on the economy resulting from the reduction in military construction. I can only say that Alaska being Alaska, it will find other roads to economic independence. Alaska is a land of promise due to its many virtually untouched resources and its vigorous people.

I think that Alaska's future depends on the development of its resources. If its resources are developed, then its future will be better than its past or present. If this is not done, then I do not know how it will continue to grow. My advice is to develop them as rapidly as possible. This job is much larger than any which has been performed in the past.

Much of the preliminary work leading to full resource development has been done. I feel I can speak with authority on this subject. Shortly after Alaska came under the American flag in 1867, Army Engineers came here singly or in small groups to conduct trail explorations, waterway explorations, and to chart Alaska's resources at a time when their fellow countrymen still considered Alaska as Seward's Folly.

They continued this work beyond the turn of the century. In this century, before the start of World War II, they have dredged channels for ocean shipping and built and expanded harbors. They were charter members and continued to serve on the original Alaska Road Commission for 33 years; they helped to survey and build the Alaska Railroad.

Our work directed along these lines was interrupted for several years due to the immensity of the warwork, but in 1949 the responsibility for continuing the civil works was given to the Alaska District. The first assignment of our civil works people was in the tradition of their forerunners. The oldtimers would recognize it as a typical large order. They were assigned to map the water resources of Alaska and to report their findings to Congress. The potential of hundreds of streams and lakes and coastal waters in all parts of Alaska had to be gaged to fill the order.

Our civil works men have completed this survey of water resources in Alaska and soon will make their final report to Congress. They examined the resources for navigation, flood control, recreation, and hydroelectric potential. What they found in hydropower potential exceeds Alaska's gold by many multiples in economic possibilities, if not in glamor.

Alaska has about 18 million kilowatts potential in hydroelectric power at sites ranging from the very small to the mammoth.

I would like to review briefly a few hydropower developments and what contributions to the economy can be expected from them.

On the Kenai Peninsula southeast of Homer, a site at Bradley Lake has been subjected to a detailed engineering study. This site is located near enough to Anchorage so that it could supply low-cost power that will be needed here in the near future. Bradley is a medium-sized project having a potential capacity of approximately 64,000 kilowatts. The estimated cost of construction is $45,750,000.

The project has been recommended for construction by the Alaska District and favorably reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington, D.C. It is fully expected that the project will be presented for appropriation of construction funds. Conceivably, Bradley could be built and producing power in 1965 or 1966.

In the meantime, the Alaska District is continuing to investigate the feasibility of a hydroelectric project on the Yukon River at Rampart Canyon, northwest of Fairbanks. This project is of such magnitude that, if it is carried through to completion, it will stand with the hydroelectric giants of the world, having a capacity in the neighborhood of 5 million kilowatts.

Detailed engineering studies are being made of Rampart. This spring we will make drill tests through the ice for foundation data.

Another study will soon be launched under the direction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to determine the effects of the completed project on the wildlife of the area.

In the near future, we expect to announce that a world-renowned firm has been retained to conduct an economic study of the effects of the project on the economy of Alaska and the Nation as a whole.

Rampart is frequently thought of as being a remote project—something that may be built in the next generation. This is not necessarily so. The studies made by Army Engineers indicate that Rampart could be producing power for industry by 1971–72 if full authorization and funding are forthcoming.

Even Rampart's total capacity will be insufficient for the future demands of power-hungry industries—industries which process metal ores through electrical processes and industries that are auxiliary to these.

Among those industries that use electroprocessing—that is, electricity as a raw material and ingredient rather than as a source of power—are the processors of aluminum, magnesium, titanium, zirconium, hafnium, electric steel, electric pig iron, electrolytic copper, zinc, nickel, ferroalloys, chlorine, and caustic soda, calcium carbide, elemental phosphorus, artificial abrasives, and many others.

The amount of energy required is enormous. For example, 1 ton of aluminum consumes 15,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy, and 1 ton of elemental phosphorus consumes 13,000 kilowatt-hours. Even the smallest processing plants of this nature use large amounts of power, and it must be low-cost for them to compete. The power cost is their main expense, and they will, as they must, locate where power is the cheapest.

The cost of Rampart power delivered at tidewater at Anchorage has been generously estimated at 3 mills. There is not another project in Alaska in the planning stages which could be built and on the line in 10 years with this kind of low-cost power.

I realize that Rampart's vastness is the subject of concern, but I must say that it is too big only if there will not be a market for its power. As a matter of fact, there is a demand for this amount of power in the Nation and the world, and this demand is expected to grow in the future.

The cost of building Rampart is estimated at $1,300 million. It is a lot of money, but I have recommended that engineering studies be pushed ahead as rapidly as possible because the development is needed.

Recently a board of civilian advisers has been appointed to assist the Alaska District and the Corps of Engineers with the Rampart studies. They include Mrs. Irene Ryan

and Mr. Stanley McCutcheon, of Anchorage. Other Alaskans named to the board are Mr. W. T. Kegley, president of the First National Bank of Juneau, who will represent Governor Egan; Mr. Frank H. Mapleton, a mechanical engineer of Fairbanks; and Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska. Other than Alaskans, the board consists of Dr. Edward Steve Shaw, an economist for Stanford University; Mr. Samuel B. Morris, a prominent consulting engineer of Los Angeles; and Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association of Vancouver, Washington. The assistance of these highly qualified people will be invaluable in planning and developing Rampart.

It has been a pleasure to meet and talk with you today. I am glad that I have the vantage of the corps' 20 years of military construction experience as a basis from which to make my remarks on Alaska's economy. These remarks would be difficult to boil down to one statement.

If I attempted, the result would go something like this: Alaska's future growth depends, now more than ever, on the wise and rapid development of its tremendous resources.

SENATOR KEATING CALLS FOR NEW EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the continuing state of turmoil and conflict in the Middle East should be of great concern to all of us. Arab-Israeli differences represent a dangerous threat to efforts to achieve world peace.

It must be recognized that Israel is America's best friend in the Middle East and that she is here to stay. Starting from that premise, I believe our Government sought new initiatives to bring peace to this troubled area of the world.

My distinguished colleague, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, recently delivered an eloquent address to the Jewish National Fund Assembly here in Washington, in which he called for new efforts to mediate a settlement of Arab-Israeli differences. He also voiced well-merited praise for the wonderful work of the J.N.F. in promoting the planting of forests in Israel and suggested an extension of this program to underdeveloped nations of the world.

Senator KEATING's words are of particular significance because of his long-standing friendship for the State of Israel and because he is one of the comparatively few Americans who has had a forest dedicated in his name in Israel. His address deserves wide circulation and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING BEFORE THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND ASSEMBLY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 26, 1961

To me there is something deeply and touchingly symbolic in the magnificent project undertaken by the Jewish National Fund—the Freedom Forest in Israel. This forest will stand, through centuries of time, as a token, a living token, of the great and lasting ties that bind together the United States of America and the Republic of Israel. This forest will be in a very real sense a transplant of friendship, a bond as eternal as nature itself, an exemplar of the affinity of two great cultures, joined in the common struggle to make freedom not a mere word or slogan but a dynamic reality—to make human brotherhood not a dream, but a realization—not something on the lips—but something in the heart.

How inspiring a concept this national forest represents. Israel extends the hand of friendship not only to the totality of America—but individually, to each State, and to the District of Columbia—thus personalizing in a most appropriate way the relationship of our two great peoples.

Each forest will have not only its grand, universal significance. It will have as well, for Americans who visit Israel from whatever State of our Nation, its heart-lifting personal significance. The whispering trees will speak to all Americans in the accent freemen understand; the accent of humanity, the accent of fraternity, the accent of a common love of liberty.

About a year and a half ago, I visited Israel again. It was my high privilege to go there this time at the invitation of the Israeli Government.

A high privilege and—more than that—a high honor, too—for the Israeli Government invited me on the occasion of the dedication of the Senator Ken Keating Forest—a part of the inspiring American Freedom Forest project that we formally inaugurate this day.

In connection with the dedication of what I like to call my forest there occurred a little incident I'd like to tell you about. On the appointed day, in the company of the official committee, I ascended one of the beautiful Judean hills that look down upon Jerusalem. At the site chosen for the forest to be planted in my honor, I was handed a spade.

I thought, in a fleeting moment, of the words of Chaim Weizmann, when he, personally, uprooted himself from a great past, a great career, to follow his dream of helping Jews to Palestine—helping these people who came, as he so well put it, "with a psalm on their lips and a spade in their hands."

My own spade, in this moment of dedication, was poised above the hard, rocky, resistant soil, and I could not help but remark to the chairman of the occasion, "It does not seem possible that trees would take root in this stony ground." He smiled and said, "In Israel the trees, like the people, are inspired to grow by the very difficulties of growing."

The success of Israel can be summed up, I believe, in the posture of mind that inspired such an observation. Difficulty can defeat the will of man—or conversely, it can be the stimulant that prods him to great and sustained effort. It can be the wall that holds timidity back or the wall that driving energy breaks through.

Israel stands today, in a real and soul-lifting sense, as a victory of the human spirit over adversity—the adversity of nature, the adversity of man. Israel was built from the soul outward—and, as her history shows, she has thrived, rather than withered, in the face of difficulties and hardships that only a great heart and a great purpose could withstand.

Before going to Israel, I had absorbed an imposing fund of statistics attesting to her growth, to her dynamism, to the will and dedication of her people.

Such statistics are impressive, but they are mere arithmetic until life is breathed into them by the fact of one's own physical presence in Israel.

In a word, I found Israel to be a many-splendored country with what I might call, in the language of today, a thrust of enthusiasm, of ambition, of sheer will to work, that has lifted it out of the past and is driving it to new and greater frontiers of achievement in the world of today.

It is fitting, eminently fitting, that the Jewish National Fund should have been originated, and that it should be committed to the great task it has set for itself. It is fitting, as well, that your success thus far should be so splendid, so inspiring. For you are contributing to the growth and the greatness of one of the very sources of America's growth and greatness—the fountainhead of Jewish culture—the homeland of a dynamic and gifted people—the Republic of Israel. Israel has infused our Nation with a great stream of intellect, of talent, of energy, of drive, of enthusiasm. The Jewish people, since our Nation's birth, have been a vital part of the miracle that is America.

The potentialities of the American Freedom Forest project are so great that I should like to propose an extension of Israel's efforts. Just as this forest in Israel is a symbol of the ties uniting Israel and the United States in love of freedom, so other forests of a similar nature which the Israeli Government could sponsor and organize throughout undeveloped countries would be a sign that Israel, like the United States, is not satisfied with wealth for itself, but seeks also the benefit and welfare of all free nations.

Israel has much to offer along these lines to other new and struggling countries that may lack the skills and ingenuity which have historically distinguished those who now call Israel their homeland.

Indeed, Israel has already demonstrated, in a tangible and extremely generous fashion for a small country, her desire to help those less fortunate.

I could envisage a whole string of freedom forests in Africa, in those dry and arid areas where soil erosion is constant, and where reclamation and reforestation hold genuine promise.

On the troubled continent of Africa, Israel has already shown she realizes that she has an important part to play, not a destructive role, such as the U.A.R. and certain other nations are assuming, but a helpful, constructive role, not political but economic, not self-seeking but humanitarian. The Freedom Forest shows how Israel can turn the desert into a garden. A unique contribution to world peace and progress can be made by sharing this talent with others less skilled and able.

In order to make possible an expanded program of Israeli aid to Africa, it is most important to make a final end to Arab-Israeli rivalry. I hope early and effective action can be taken by our new President to bring about a negotiated settlement of Arab-Israeli differences. Israel's own promise of economic growth and democratic development is being fulfilled. But in order for Israel to fulfill her wider promise on the whole free world arena it is necessary for the United States to fulfill its promise and to take all necessary steps to resolve the futile and destructive policy of boycott which has cut Israel off from her natural neighbors.

The United States should take up the problem of Middle Eastern tensions and exert every effort to work out a settlement that would on the one hand recognize Israel's existence, its geographic boundaries, and on the other hand would offer the Arab States full assistance in the rehabilitation and resettlement of Arab refugees within Arab countries, including compensation from Israel for properties lost.

The early stages of a new administration offer a good opportunity for renewed efforts to mediate the bitter Arab-Israeli dispute. Israel already has shown its willingness on many occasions to meet its neighbors half way.

This would be an ideal time to again impress upon the U.A.R. and Israel's other neighbors America's interest in relieving the dangerous tensions in that area. I hope our new President will use his good offices to induce negotiations between the principals involved. The time to act is now.

The future of the Middle East depends on regional cooperation and development. The Arab leaders are shortchanging their own people by refusing to join in the efforts of Israel to transform the barren wasteland of this area into a productive oasis. Cooperation not conflict should be their byword if economic progress is their goal.

The poet has said that only God can make a tree. But God looks to man to give meaning to trees, to use them in man's own struggle to find his fulfillment, to conquer the wild and adverse forces of nature, to turn lands of waste into lands of growth, of fertility, of beauty.

This is the significance not only of reforestation, it is the significance of Israel. For Israel, too, was a seed that has flowered into a great sheltering tree, despite barren ground, despite an unfavorable climate of thought and action.

Every experiment in human betterment, every probing into the scientific unknown, every eager response to the challenge of the manifold problems that beset a new nation—these are the marks of greatness that must inevitably prevail against the forces of frustration and of enmity.

We are aware only too vividly of the island status of the Republic of Israel in an unfriendly sea. But to me—as one who has been there—the great force and influence of Israel is like a tide breaking upon the shore. The shore inescapably must change. It cannot ignore the tide. It must feel its pressures, it must take nourishment from its waters. It must one day realize the tremendous flow of vitality and health and human progress that this beneficent tide represents. Israel has joined the world. The world must join Israel.

MARCH 2, ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAN INDEPENDENCE AND THE BIRTHDAY OF SAM HOUSTON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to say that Texans throughout America and around the world pause today for a double observance: First, to observe the anniversary of the Texas declaration of independence from Mexico. It was 125 years ago that our proud forebears gathered in a dilapidated blacksmith shop in Washington-on-the Brazos in Texas to declare their independence, while Santa Anna's army of some 5,000 then had the Alamo besieged, and couriers were coming in and telling of the course of the siege that had been going on at the Alamo for some 7 days before Texas declared its independence. They signed a document proclaiming that—

> The people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations * * * we fearlessly and confidently commit the issue of the decision to the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of nations.

This date is now a holiday in our State. Texas maintained its independence for more than 10 years. It had treaties with the United States, England, the Kingdoms of Holland and France, and the leading commercial nations of the world. Texas had consular agents on every continent and was a recognized independent nation with its own currency, its own laws, its own diplomatic service, and its own navy, which fought a number of notable battles in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Caribbean.

It so happens that the anniversary of the independence of Texas was also the birthday of the commander in chief of the Texas Army at San Jacinto, Gen. Sam Houston. General Houston is one of the great heroes of my State and of the Nation. He served in the Senate as one of the first Senators from Texas. He served here for approximately 13 years in a career that won for him a high accolade from the present President of the United States in his book "Profiles in Courage."

Gen. Sam Houston opposed the secession of my State. He opposed the extension of slavery in a State and where support of slavery was a popular political issue in his day. He had courage which has not been surpassed by any other man, I believe, in the long history of this body.

At the time of its declaration of independence, March 2, 1836, Texas had a population of civilized settlers of approximately 30,000 and was opposing a nation of several million people. All Texans know that it was 4 days after the declaration of its independence that the garrison of 187 men at the Alamo fought to the death against an army of more than 5,000 in one of the most heroic battles and stands for liberty in the history of mankind. It was a great epoch of the American people. The defenders of the Alamo had their option. They could have retreated. They could have gotten away. They chose to stand and fight to the death in an attempt to aid Sam Houston, who was a couple of hundred miles farther east, to save Texas. That battle, which inspired the cry, "Remember the Alamo," led the Texas forces to victory less than 2 months later under Sam Houston over the dictator Santa Anna at the battle of San Jacinto.

On this day of March 2, the anniversary of Texas independence, Gen. Sam Houston was born on March 2, 1793, in Rockbridge County, Va., on a farm about 7 miles from Lexington. He is the only man in the history of the American people who was elected Governor of two different States in this Nation, having been elected in both Tennessee, and in Texas after it came into the Union. He was the only man in American history to achieve that distinction. He was also twice elected President of the Republic of Texas. He was commander in chief of the armies, and achieved many other notable accomplishments.

I do not want this dual anniversary to pass without it being noted and called to the attention of the Senate, because Senator Houston had the most distinguished record of any man from my State, and the most distinguished record any man has ever had in this body from Texas.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, according to the Employment Act of 1946 the Joint Economic Committee is supposed to file its report on the Economic Report of the President on March 1 of each year. In order to allow more time for presentation of the views of the incoming administration the committee has had to extend the date of its hearings and has agreed to request that it be given until April 30 to file its report. The report will be filed earlier, if possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee be given to April 30 to file the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LET THE LIGHT FALL UPON OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there appeared on February 16, 1961, in the Wooster, Ohio, Daily Record newspaper an editorial entitled "Secret Diplomacy," which in my opinion contains some constructive views and suggestions and which should be made available for the reading by other Members of the Congress.

Mr. President, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECRET DIPLOMACY

It appears that the practice of regular international diplomacy which is essentially a quiet, gumshoe business gives special advantage to men like Premier Khrushchev who do not need to report in full to the folks at home.

But President Kennedy's problem here, which Walter Lippmann has quickly identified, isn't stranded on the horns of an impossible dilemma. Certainly certain details of the play by play between our negotiators and theirs must remain confidential for a decent interval. And yet the colossal ignorance of most Americans about foreign policy need not be compounded by official silence.

There is much that can be said. There are many, many details of interest and of significance that can be related to the American people. Above all, frequent public discussion by President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Ambassador Stevenson must progressively and intelligently give to the people clear understanding of the great goals which our negotiators seek. These goals need never be hidden. In fact, the very widespread publication of these goals gives worldwide support to our diplomats in every land and climate.

Regular reports to the American people, perhaps monthly, perhaps weekly, now from the White House or New State in Washington, now from public platforms on Main Street—Indianapolis, Topeka, Boise, etc.—can provide good balance to secret diplomacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 50, S. 912, the omnibus judgeship bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "one additional district judge for the northern district of California" and insert "two additional district judges for the northern district of California, two additional district judges for the southern district of California,"; in line 14, after the word "Connecticut", to strike out "two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida,"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "Massachusetts", to strike out "one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan," and insert "two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan,"; in line 7, after the word "Mississippi", to insert "one additional district judge for the western district of Missouri, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada,"; in line 12, after the word "New York", to strike out "one additional district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina," and insert "one additional district judge for the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the western and middle districts of North Carolina,"; in line 17, after the word "Ohio", to insert "one additional district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma,"; in line 22, after the word "Puerto Rico", to insert "one additional district judge for the district of Rhode Island,"; in line 23, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "one additional district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina," and insert "one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina,"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "Tennessee", to strike out "one additional district judge for the northern district of Texas," and insert "two additional district judges for the northern district of Texas,"; in line 8, after the word "Texas", to strike out "and one additional district judge for the western district of Texas." and insert "one additional district judge for the western district of Texas, and one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington."; on page 5, in the material after line 15, after:

Arkansas:
Eastern and western ---- 2

To strike out:

California:
Northern ---- 8

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

California:
Northern ---- 9
Southern ---- 13

On page 6, after the heading "Districts," to strike out:

Florida:
Southern ---- 6

After the line:

Massachusetts ---- 6

To strike out:

Michigan:
Eastern ---- 7

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Michigan:
Eastern ---- 8

After the line:

Mississippi:
Southern ---- 2

To insert:

Missouri:
Western ---- 3

After the amendment just above stated, to insert:

Nevada ---- 2

After the line:

New York:
Southern ---- 24

To strike out:

North Carolina:
Eastern, middle, and western ---- 1

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

North Carolina:
Eastern and middle ---- 1
Western and middle ---- 1

At the top of page 7, after the line:

Ohio:
Northern ---- 7

To insert:

Oklahoma:
Northern, eastern, and western ---- 2

After the line:

Puerto Rico ---- 2

To insert:

Rhode Island ---- 2

After the amendment just above stated, to insert:

South Carolina:
Eastern and Western ---- 2

After the amendment just above stated, to strike out:

South Carolina:
Eastern ---- 2

In the line:

Texas:
Northern

To strike out "4" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "5".

On page 7, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out:

The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to Washington is amended by striking therefrom:

Eastern and Western ---- 1

After line 3, to strike out:

(e) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan. The first vacancy occuring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

On page 8, after line 2, to strike out:

(f) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

At the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(e)"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(g)"; after line 21, to insert:

(h) The second sentence of section 83 (a) (2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Western Division shall be held at Little Rock and Pine Bluff."

At the top of page 9, to insert:

(i) The second sentence of section 123 (c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Western Director shall be held at Memphis and Dyersburg."

After line 4, to insert:

(j) One of the district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana shall reside in East Baton Rouge Parish.

After line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 89. Florida

"Florida is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the northern, middle, and southern districts of Florida.

"NORTHERN DISTRICT

"(a) The northern district comprises the counties of Alachua, Bay, Calhoun, Columbia, Dixie, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Gilchrist, Gulf, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Levy, Liberty, Madison, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Suwannee, Taylor, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington.

"Court for the northern district shall be held at Tallahassee, Pensacola, Marianna, Gainesville, Panama City, and Live Oak.

"MIDDLE DISTRICT

"(b) The middle district comprises the counties of Baker, Bradford, Brevard, Charlotte, Citrus, Clay, De Soto, Duval, Flagler, Hardee, Hernando, Hillsborough, Lake Manatee, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Putnam, Saint Johns, Sarasota, Seminole, Sumter, Union, and Volusia.

"Court for the middle district shall be held at Jacksonville, Ocala, Tampa, Fernandina, and Orlando.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(c) The southern district comprises the counties of Broward, Collier, Dade, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Indian River, Lee, Martin, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, and Saint Lucie.

"Court for the southern district shall be held at Key West, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, Miami, and Fort Myers."

On page 10, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the middle district of Florida.

(b) Hereafter the district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida shall be the district judge for the middle district of Florida.

After line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended as follows with respect to the State of Florida:

"Northern ---- 1
Middle ---- 3
Southern ---- 4"

(b) The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code relating

to Florida is amended by striking therefrom:

"Northern and southern ..... 1"

And, on page 11, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28 is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States as provided in the first paragraph in section 135 of title 28. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three additional circuit judges for the second circuit, two additional circuit judges for the fourth circuit, two additional circuit judges for the fifth circuit, one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit.

(b) In order that the table contained in section 44(a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

"Circuits	Number of judges
* * * * *	
Second	Nine
* * * * *	
Fourth	Five
Fifth	Nine
* * * * *	
Seventh	Seven
* * * * *	
Tenth	Six."

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama, one additional district judge for the district of Alaska, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona, one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, two additional district judges for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut, one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia, two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois, one additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa, one additional district judge for the district of Kansas, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana, two additional district judges for the district of Maryland, one additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi, one additional district judge for the western district of Missouri, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, six additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the western and middle districts of North Carolina, two additional district judges for the northern district of Ohio, one additional district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma, three additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, one additional district judge for the district of Rhode Island, one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee, one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee, two additional district judges for the northern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the southern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the western district of Texas, and one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington.

(b) The existing district judgeship for the middle district of Georgia, created by the Act of March 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 16), entitled "An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia", and the existing district judgeships for the district of New Mexico and the western district of Pennsylvania created by paragraphs (1) and (5) respectively, of section 2(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes", approved February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 10), shall be permanent judgeships and the present incumbents of such judgeships shall henceforth hold their offices under section 133 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act. The Act of March 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 16), and paragraphs (1) and (5) of section 2(b) of the Act of February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 10) are hereby repealed.

(c) The existing district judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Washington, heretofore provided for by section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, shall hereafter be a district judgeship for the western district of Washington only, and the present incumbent of such judgeship shall henceforth hold his office under section 133, as amended by this Act.

(d) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent district judgeships for said districts and combination of districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts	Judges
Alabama:	
Northern	3
* * * * *	
Alaska	2
Arizona	3
Arkansas:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and western	2
* * * * *	
California:	
Northern	9
Southern	13
Colorado	3
Connecticut	4
* * * * *	
Georgia:	
Northern	3
Middle	2
* * * * *	
Illinois:	
Northern	10
* * * * *	
Iowa:	
* * * * *	
Northern and Southern	1
Kansas	3
* * * * *	
Louisiana:	
Eastern	4
* * * * *	
Maryland	4
Massachusetts	6
Michigan:	
Eastern	*8*
* * * * *	
Mississippi:	
* * * * *	
Southern	2
* * * * *	
Missouri:	
* * * * *	
Western	*3*
* * * * *	
Nevada	*2*
* * * * *	
New Jersey	8
New Mexico	2
New York:	
* * * * *	
Southern	24
* * * * *	
North Carolina:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and Middle	*1*
Western and Middle	*1*
* * * * *	
Ohio:	
Northern	7
* * * * *	
Oklahoma:	
* * * * *	
Northern, Eastern, and Western	*2*
* * * * *	
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	11
* * * * *	
Western	8
Puerto Rico	2
* * * * *	
Rhode Island	*2*
South Carolina:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and Western	*2*
* * * * *	
Tennessee:	
Eastern	3
Middle	2
Western	2
Texas:	
Northern	5
Southern	5
* * * * *	
Western	3
* * * * *	
Washington:	
* * * * *	
Western	*3*
* * * * *".	

(e) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the eastern district of New York. The first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(f) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(g) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(h) The second sentence of section 83(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Western Division shall be held at Little Rock and Pine Bluff."

(i) The second sentence of section 123(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Western Director shall be held at Memphis and Dyersburg."

(j) One of the district judges for the Eastern District of Louisiana shall reside in East Baton Rouge Parish.

SEC. 3. Section 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 89. Florida

"Florida is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Middle, and Southern Districts of Florida.

"NORTHERN DISTRICT

"(a) The Northern District comprises the counties of Alachua, Bay, Calhoun, Columbia, Dixie, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Gilchrist, Gulf, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Levy, Liberty, Madison, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Suwannee, Taylor, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington.

"Court for the Northern District shall be held at Tallahassee, Pensacola, Marianna, Gainesville, Panama City, and Live Oak.

"MIDDLE DISTRICT

"(b) The Middle District comprises the counties of Baker, Bradford, Brevard, Charlotte, Citrus, Clay, De Soto, Duval, Flagler, Hardee, Hernando, Hillsborough, Lake, Manatee, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Putnam, Saint Johns, Sarasota, Seminole, Sumter, Union, and Volusia.

"Court for the Middle District shall be held at Jacksonville, Ocala, Tampa, Fernandina, and Orlando.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(c) The Southern District comprises the counties of Broward, Collier, Dade, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Indian River, Lee, Martin, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, and Saint Lucie.

"Court for the Southern District shall be held at Key West, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, Miami, and Fort Myers."

SEC. 4. (a) The President shall appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the middle district of Florida.

(b) Hereafter the district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida shall be the district judge for the middle district of Florida.

SEC. 5. (a) The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended as follows with respect to the State of Florida:

"Northern	1
Middle	3
Southern	4"

(b) The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to Florida is amended by striking therefrom:

"Northern and Southern ..... 1"

SEC. 6. The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28 is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States as provided in the first paragraph in section 135 of title 28. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER SENATOR VERA C. BUSHFIELD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, although I do not know that I really need to do so, to present Mrs. Harlan J. Bushfield, who is the widow of former Senator Bushfield. Mrs. Bushfield herself is a former U.S. Senator, having been appointed to succeed her husband and served in the Senate from October 6, 1948, to December 26, 1948.

This is the first opportunity Mrs. Bushfield has had to be present on the floor of the Senate. Since she is a former Member of the Senate, having served in her official capacity, it is a privilege for me to present her to the Senate at this time. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, when I was sworn in for my first full term as a Senator, the late Senator Bushfield was sworn in on the same day. He was one of the greatest Senators who ever sat in this body. He was a man of unimpeachable integrity and had the confidence and respect of all his colleagues. In his passing, I certainly lost a good friend.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred S. 912, a bill providing for additional circuit and district judgeships in the U.S. courts, has considered the proposed legislation and has filed with the Senate its favorable report.

The bill reported by the committee contains—with certain additions—the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States which were approved at its most recent session, September 21–23, 1960. These recommendations were supported by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress dated January 16, 1961, and they have the full support of the Department of Justice and President Kennedy. In addition, they have the complete endorsement of the American Bar Association and State and local bar associations.

There are at present 68 circuit judgeships. The bill S. 912, as reported by the committee, contains the 9 additional circuit judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference which, if approved, would bring the number of circuit judgeships to 77. Four vacancies exist in the courts of appeals.

There are now 245 district judgeships throughout the Nation. S. 912 contains the 50 judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference and, in addition, contains 10 judgeships added by the Judiciary Committee on the basis of recent data and information obtained from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, from the local circuit councils, from district courts, and from the local bar associations. As a matter of fact, I understand that certain of these additions have been considered by the committees of the Judicial Conference but the Conference itself has not formally acted, since it is not due to meet again until March 14. If the judgeships provided in the bill as reported by the committee are approved, it would bring the total number of district judgeships to 305. Twelve vacancies exist in the district courts at the present time with one nomination pending—that of William H. McRae, Jr., to be U.S. district judge in the southern district of Florida.

Mr. President, the last bill to be enacted which created additional judgeships was made the law in 1954, when 30 judgeships were approved. Even then, nine of the judgeships requested by the Judicial Conference at that time were not provided, and the report from the Committee on the Judiciary at that time stated that—

> The legislation was intended to take care of the minimum requirements for alleviating the most urgent needs of the Federal Judiciary.

The committee recognized at the time that the judgeships provided in 1954 were only a stopgap measure.

Seven years have passed since the last judgeship bill, and in the meantime the district courts have actually lost three positions as a result of the expiration of judgeships created on a temporary basis.

The judgeships provided in the bill now before the Senate are fully warranted.

The civil business of the courts has skyrocketed in the last 20 years. Since 1941, the number of cases filed annually in the 86 district courts having exclusively Federal jurisdiction has increased more than 60 percent. The backlog of cases has risen almost 130 percent. But, in contrast, there has been during this entire 20-year period but a 25-percent increase in the number of judgeships in these districts. Where there were 150 civil cases pending per judgeship in March 1941, there are now 260 civil cases per judgeship. During 1941 the average number of cases terminated by each district judge was 196. By 1960, the average number of cases disposed of had risen to 252.

In 1950, private civil cases—which are by far the most burdensome—accounted for 22,600 of the total cases filed in the 86 districts; by 1960, this number had risen to 30,048, an increase of 33 percent.

On June 30, 1950, there were 27,771 private civil cases pending; by June 30, 1960, the backlog of private civil cases had climbed to 40,932, an increase of nearly 50 percent.

But between the years 1950 and 1960 the number of all district judgeships increased only from 221 to 245, an increase of only 11 percent, or an increase of only 24 judges for the entire Nation.

If we look at the courts of appeals, we find that in 1950 they received 2,830 cases; by 1960, they received 3,899 cases, an increase of over 37 percent. The

cases pending in the courts of appeals on June 30, 1950, were 1,675; by June 30, 1960, the cases pending totaled 2,220, an increase of 32 percent.

But during this 10-year period, only 3 circuit judgeships were created for the entire Nation, making a total of 68, or an increase of less than 8 percent.

Mr. President, even if we confine ourselves to a consideration of the last 6 months, the workload of the courts shows that the judgeships provided for in this bill are absolutely justified.

DISTRICT COURTS

The district courts had 61,251 civil cases pending on July 1, 1960. During the next 6 months, 28,425 civil cases were filed, but only 25,928 were terminated. Thus, filings outstripped terminations; and, as a result, the total number of civil cases awaiting action on January 1 was 63,748, or an increase of 2,497 over July 1.

On the criminal side, 7,691 were pending on July 1. During the period, 13,703 cases were filed and 13,283 were terminated by final disposition, leaving a total of 8,144 cases pending on December 31—or an increase of 453.

As a result, on January 1 of this year, the U.S. district courts faced a combined civil-criminal backlog of 71,992 cases, or an increase of 3,285 cases in the 6-month period.

COURTS OF APPEALS

The courts of appeals themselves are confronted with the largest backlog in a decade. Filings during the period from July 1 through December 31, 1960, increased 12½ percent, to 2,182 cases, as compared to 1,939 cases filed during the same months a year ago. At the same time, the number of cases disposed of increased from 1,599 to 1,759. Even so, the number of cases disposed of was 400 less than the number filed; and during the 6-month period the pending caseload rose from 2,220 cases, on July 1, 1960, to 2,643 on December 31, 1960. This represents an increase of 423 cases, or almost 20 percent, in the pending caseload.

Thus, the increase in judicial business is continuing, and it is the result of the trends which mark a growing nation.

Since 1950, the population of our country has increased from 150 million to nearly 180 million, an increase of 20 percent, or 30 million people.

Our gross national product has grown from $285 billion, in 1950, to an estimated $498 billion, an increase of 80 percent.

Motor vehicle registrations have spiraled from 49 million to 71 million, an increase of 45 percent.

Mr. President, the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Department of Justice are convinced that a substantial increase in judgepower is required in order to enable the Federal courts to keep up with the current annual inflow of civil and criminal business.

These recommendations for the creation of new judgeships span the length and breadth of this country, because the problem of congestion and delay is not confined to a few localities. It is a national problem. The recommendations, therefore, are not concentrated in or confined to any one district, any one State, or any one circuit.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that the provisions of this bill warrant the immediate attention of the Senate. Even if the bill is passed by us, we must await action by the House of Representatives, and then we must hold a conference. Only after the two Houses reach agreement will the bill be forwarded to the President. After he receives the bill, considerable time will pass, of course, before the candidates can be selected and screened and before the nominations can be forthcoming to the Senate. Even then, of course, we shall have to hold a hearing on each of the nominations. In other words, an urgent time factor is involved if we wish to get this additional judicial manpower into the courts during this calendar year.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee that I have listened with very great interest to the report he has made to the Senate on this very much needed measure to increase the number of Federal judgeships and also the number of circuit judgeships in this country.

I am sure the distinguished chairman of this important committee is aware of what is needed in practically every one of the States of the Nation.

I am supporting this bill. I do not profess to know the needs and the requirements of some of the other States; but I am sure—and I am certain the distinguished Senator from Mississippi knows it—that in my State of Kansas there has been a terrifically heavy caseload for as long as the last 5 or 6 years.

The recommendations the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has made are of vital importance to litigants in the courts. As a matter of fact, due to the long and inordinate delays, there has been much criticism, by reason of the fact that it has not been possible to decrease the caseload.

I merely say this measure is a step in the right direction, and I am supporting the bill because of the need for its enactment, even though we were not able to obtain its enactment 2 years ago or 4 years ago. I believe this measure requires our immediate attention.

Last, but not least, I wish to see judges of excellent caliber appointed to these positions, if, as, and when the nominations come to us for consideration.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the Senator from Kansas, for his statement.

I should like to add that in the country there are districts in which it is necessary to wait 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years in order to have a trial. Consequently, there has been a racket. Because a man cannot sue promptly and get a judgment, he has to compromise his claim at a much lower figure than the amount owing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the committee made inquiry of the incumbent judges, let us say in the northern district of Ohio, to determine from them what number of new judges is needed?

I ask that question because I have word from three of the judges in the northern district. Two of them feel that we need one new judge. One feels we need two.

When I testified before the committee, I believe 3 or 4 weeks ago, I took the position that in the northern district we definitely needed one, but I was not certain that we needed two judges. At that time the backlog of cases was 1,800. Today the backlog is 900.

So I ask the question, Has the committee made inquiry of the incumbent judges as to what number of judges is needed to put the court in a position to deal, with reasonable dispatch, with the cases that are pending?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Judiciary Committee has not made inquiry. The Judicial Conference gets the information from each district. It sorts the information and considers it. In the bill two additional district judges are provided for the northern district of Ohio. That number was recommended by the Judicial Conference. Here is the statement:

> The backlog increased steadily up to 1955, at which time a severe reversal of trend occurred. In the past 5 years the backlog has been reduced from 1,619 cases to 936 cases. New cases commenced have remained relatively stable during that period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My point is that it was suggested two judges were needed when this backlog was, as I understand it, 1,800, and that backlog has now been brought down to 900.

May I ask the Senator what the date of that report is?

Mr. EASTLAND. This is a current report, dated January 1 of this year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the situation back in 1957, when we first considered the bill, concerning the backlog in the northern district of Ohio?

Mr. EASTLAND. We shall have to get the Senator that information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The argument has been made to me that when there was a backlog of 1,800 cases it was suggested 2 judges were needed. Now the backlog has been brought down to 900, demonstrating that there is no need for 2 judges.

Mr. EASTLAND. Well, that is the recommendation of the Judicial Conference. I should like to say that the caseload in that district is below the national average. If the Senator desires to strike one out——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would want to talk to my colleague, but I would have no hesitation in saying that we should do what the Senator suggests, because my experience has been that, in the judiciary, if there is greater application to work, the caseload will be reduced, in most cases.

Mr. EASTLAND. In many districts; I certainly agree.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that the questions propounded by the very able Senator from Ohio are very pertinent inquiries, and I think the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has responded from the record of the Judicial Conference.

We in Colorado have had occasion to talk to present Federal judges. We have had occasion to look into the records of the Judicial Conference. I thought it might be helpful to the Senator from Ohio to offer what we have learned. We look at the caseload and the increase in population, and we go to our judges and ask, "What is the situation?" Our judges have written us.

More than that, we have gone to the records of the Judicial Conference to determine whether or not we need a judge. I am referring to Colorado. I use Colorado as an example. The situation may be different elsewhere.

The Judicial Conference has said 6 months between the filing of simple suits and the time of trial is an ideal period. Some have called this figure unrealistic. Real or not, the sad fact is that in fiscal 1960 the national median time between filing and trial was 15.4 months. The median time in Colorado was 23.7—almost 2 years.

It is an unhappy fact that the national median interval between issue and trial is 11.5 months; in Colorado, it is 17.1 months. And the national median interval in civil suits from filing to disposition stands at 17.8 months; Colorado's median interval is 26.1 months.

For the last 5 years the number of criminal trials in our district of Colorado has averaged twice the national average per judge; 55 percent of the total trial time in the district has been taken by criminal cases, compared to the national average of 31 percent.

Let me make a brief statement about the bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased to add my support today to the proposal of President Kennedy, sponsored by Senators EASTLAND and JOHNSTON as S. 912, to create 69 new Federal district and circuit judgeships.

The great and pressing need for these additional judges has been testified to, year in and year out, for many years, by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, both Attorneys General William Rogers and Robert Kennedy have called for the creation of new judgeships.

Just to look at the heavy caseload, the increasing delays in litigation, and the great backlog which currently burdens our Federal courts is to be convinced of the pressing—indeed crucial—need for these additional judges.

The new Attorney General has said:

> Delay in the disposition of judicial business is not only a catastrophe to the litigants whose properties and liberties are at stake, but also to the public generally.
>
> Failure to provide a forum in which litigation may be disposed of within a reasonable time works to thwart justice, causes considerable hardship, and will tend to destroy respect for our judicial system, a bulwark of our democracy.

In this I heartily concur.

The old maxim, "Justice delayed is justice denied," is here applicable. The respect the citizens of our democracy hold for justice and the courts is in part dependent upon their right to a fair and prompt trial. It should be evident to all that justice, which may require 2 years or more to obtain, is neither prompt nor fair.

As an example of the importance of prompt affirmative action on this bill by the Congress, let me give the Senate information on the judicial district of my own State of Colorado.

This information is taken from a report on the judicial business of the U.S. District Court of Colorado, prepared under the direction of an old friend and a respected Coloradoan, Will Shafroth, Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Colorado, since 1954, has had two Federal judges sitting in its district. Our State has been fortunate in the quality and ability of its judges.

Chief Judge W. Lee Knous, a previous Governor and a man both loved and respected, served with honor and distinction until his death in December 1959. With him on the bench, until elevated to the court of appeals, was Judge Jean Breitenstein. Judge Breitenstein was replaced by Judge Alfred A. Arraj who now presides with Judge Hatfield Chilson who entered on duty March 17, 1960.

These men are honorable, diligent, effective men.

Judges Arraj and Chilson have worked with energy and dedication, even foregoing vacations, in their efforts to master the backlog of cases currently on the docket. By their efforts the backlog has been kept from growing but it has not been diminished. Judge Arraj has said:

> We badly need now, and have needed for a long time, a third judge here.

The Judicial Conference has said 6 months between the filing of civil suits and the time of trial is an ideal period; some have called this figure unrealistic. Real or not, the sad fact is that in fiscal 1960 the national median time between filing and trial, was 15.4 months. The median time in Colorado was 23.7—almost 2 years.

It is an unhappy fact that the national median interval between issue and trial is 11.5 months; in Colorado, it is 17.1 months. And the national median interval in civil suits from filing to disposition stands at 17.8 months; Colorado's median interval is 26.1 months.

For the last 5 years the number of criminal trials in our district of Colorado has averaged twice the national average per judge. Fifty-five percent of the total trial time in the district has been taken by criminal cases, compared to the national average of 31 percent.

This heavy criminal case burden in part accounts for the large backlog of civil cases burdening the Colorado district: As of June 30, 1960, there were 392 civil cases pending before the court. In fiscal year 1960, 382 civil suits were instituted, and 394 terminated. The backlog of civil cases has quadrupled in the last 20 years—from 99 in 1941 to 392 in 1960.

Colorado is one of the fastest growing States in the Union. In 10 years our population has grown by 37 percent; it now stands at over 1,740,000. Metropolitan Denver, our largest city, is now approaching the million mark, and there is every reason to believe the city and the State will continue to grow at a comparable pace.

Because of these facts, this session, as in the last, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] joined with me in sponsoring a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for Colorado.

I am especially pleased to note that the President has seen fit to incorporate our bill, S. 157, within the proposal which we consider today.

The additional district judge for Colorado, plus the additional circuit judge for the 10th circuit, I assure the Senate, will go far toward guaranteeing that justice will be served, promptly and fully. I know that Colorado's need for relief is not unique; all over the country Federal judicial districts are similarly hard pressed. I cannot, therefore, support too strongly this measure. I urge its prompt adoption.

We looked at the situation in Colorado. We looked at the records. What about the trial? What about the criminal cases? How long does it take to clear the dockets?

It was based on this sort of investigation and examination of the records of the Federal judges that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself came to the conclusion that we needed a judge. The Judicial Conference reached the same conclusion independently.

I think the point made by the chairman of the committee is that these district judges are independent men. The Judicial Conference is headed by the Chief Justice of the United States. The circuit judges and the district judges meet in conference. What else do they have? They have an administrative office, and the men in that office are watching the backlog of cases.

I have given this general outline. The situation may be different in Ohio. The able chairman knows that we in the Judiciary Committee have sought to curb and limit the number of cases going into the Federal courts, because of the tremendous backlog.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. We raised the minimum jurisdiction of the district courts from $3,000 to $10,000.

I may say to the Senator from Ohio that my information is, with respect to the request for the two judges in the northern district of Ohio, that even though the caseload is reduced because of the increased jurisdictional amount, the workload is still great because of the kind and caliber of cases pending. That was the reason why the Judicial Conference recommended two additional judges.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Colorado, based on his own experience, I think would subscribe to the idea that a period of 6 months within which to bring a case to issue, from the filing of proper pleadings and all the preliminaries to the trial of the case, is a little unreasonable to expect.

Mr. CARROLL. Some have said it is unrealistic.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask the Senator from Mississippi, is the number of judges recommended a complete duplicate of what the Judicial Conference has suggested?

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it a complete duplicate?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Has any modification been made of the recommendations of the Judicial Conference?

Mr. EASTLAND. Well, it depends on where the judgeships have been added.

I am not going to be bound in every instance by that, but the judgeships have been approved by the committee, which reports to the Judicial Conference. The Judicial Conference does not meet until later this year. It is our judgment that the recommendations will be approved at that time.

I should like to make another statement in regard to the northern district of Ohio; that is, it takes 2 years to get a case disposed of there.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The time is down to 18 months now.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I inquired today, and I was told that.

Have the recommendations of the Judicial Conference been reduced, as distinguished from increased, in regard to numbers recommended?

Mr. EASTLAND. They have been increased.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In any instance has there been a reduction?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the recommendation of the Judicial Conference was accepted fully as to numbers, except in those instances when requests were made to provide a number over and above that which was recommended?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. There has been a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which has constantly worked on the problem. That was first done under the late Senator Hennings, and also under the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. We thought the requests were merited.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not taking exception at all. I recognize the excellence of the work which has been done by the Senators.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to make a comment, from the report on the northern district of Ohio. The improvement in recent years of the number of pending civil cases has tended to mask the fact that the Cleveland area generates a constant stream of big cases which have not been tried and which will require substantial trial time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is one question I do not think was answered. When the bill was originally introduced—I think it was in 1957—what was the backlog in the northern district of Ohio? Ohio?

Mr. EASTLAND. We will have to get that information and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to have that information.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask if the Judicial Conference made any recommendation regarding the district judges in Kentucky, or the sixth circuit.

Mr. EASTLAND. There has been no recommendation for district judgeships in Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Did the Judicial Conference make any recommendation regarding additional judges for the District of Columbia?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it did not.

Mr. COOPER. Is there a backlog of cases in this district?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, there is not.

Mr. COOPER. There has been a great deal of talk about the incidence of crime in the District of Columbia. I simply wondered if this were the result of a lack of judges.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. There is no backlog of cases in the District of Columbia. The courts in the District of Columbia handle more cases than do the courts in the southern district of New York.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a question, and to preface it by saying that I recognize the valuable work done by the chairman and by the members of the committee.

Is it not correct that the statement in regard to the backlog of cases and the necessity for judges—and, therefore, the incidence of crime which follows such a condition—is a statement which has been true for the last 5 or 6 years? Has it not been true ever since President Eisenhower recommended, several years ago, that additional judgeships be created?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think so. I think the need has grown since he first recommended the judgeships. Of course, we created 30 additional judgeships.

Mr. COOPER. The President recommended year after year that additional judgeships be created because of the great need which existed. Is it not correct that the majority would not do anything at all?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; that is not correct.

Mr. COOPER. It is correct since 1954.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Congress, in 1954, did pass an omnibus judgeship bill which provided 30 additional judgeships.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct, but since that time there have been additional recommendations.

Mr. EASTLAND. There have been nine instances when the President's requests were turned down by a Republican Congress. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. COOPER. I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. As the Senator knows, I have always favored a judgeship bill.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the committee has taken action, and I compliment the chairman, but in fairness I believe it is proper for me to ask another question. I am sure recommendations were made in 1957, 1959, and 1960 for additional judgeships, and since about 1955 the majority has done nothing about providing them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course that is true, but in 1958 the Committee on the Judiciary reported a judgeship bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say, in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the chairman of the committee, in regard to whether the judgeships were recommended to parallel the recommendations of the Judicial Conference—the Senator from Mississippi answered in regard to those which were added—that these have been cleared through the committees of the Judicial Conference. Is that not a fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. They go from there to the Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that situation, because one of the judgeships involves the State of Washington. The Federal judge from Seattle is a member designated by the ninth circuit. I am informed that the group will meet again on March 11 or March 12, at which time they will confirm, in the opinion of the judge, what the committees have recommended.

The few additional judgeships which were recommended by the Senate committee then will be confirmed by the Judicial Conference, and this will occur perhaps before the bill is through conference.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course that will be true. In a number of instances we have included judgeships in the bill because we knew what was going to happen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee did not proceed of its own volition to simply add extra judgeships here and there. This is something which has been considered for a long time, by the Judicial Conference and by its committees.

Mr. EASTLAND. The question was asked about the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know the answer in regard to the District of Columbia. I was talking about other judgeships.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask the distinguished chairman one more question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On page 5, line 3 of the bill the so-called judicial status of the western and eastern districts of the State of Washington has been changed. I wish to commend the committee for doing that, because the judge who heretofore has acted as a judge in both districts does a great deal of work,

but the work in western Washington has increased so much that he should be there. I think the Judicial Conference so recommended. The new judge could be a roving judge.

I commend the committee for putting that language in the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Washington.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will yield to the Senator from Texas in a moment.

Mr. President, these things are not handled in a haphazard manner.

A question was asked about the District of Columbia. The Federal judges in the District of Columbia were asked by the Judicial Conference about the matter, and they voted against creating additional judgeships. They said the judgeships were adequate in number to handle the cases.

The matter did not rest simply with what they said, because a study of caseloads was made, and it was determined that the judges could handle the caseload.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I should like to commend the committee for the thorough documentation of the judgeship bill which is contained in the hearings and in the report. I have been studying the portion which deals with my own State. The entire report covers some 369 pages.

I note there have been four judgeships recommended for Texas, which have been requested by the Judicial Conference. The State board of directors of the State bar recently endorsed a recommendation that four new judgeships be created in Texas.

I introduced a bill earlier requesting three judgeships. This recommendation is for four judgeships.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not understand whether the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I was going to ask the Senator a question, for I am sure the committee considered the matter.

In the southern district of Texas did the committee consider, in adding one judge, the fact that the population increased from 1¼ million to 2½ million without the addition of any judges? The northern district of Texas—including Dallas, Fort Worth, Wichita Falls, San Angelo, Lubbock, Abilene, and Amarillo—has a population of about 3 million people, which is approximately double the population in the last issued census. For the eastern district of Texas, where the population has not increased so fast, no additional judgeship was requested. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. ENGLE obtained the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

A SECOND FEDERAL JUDGE FOR ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and indeed the whole committee for its speed in reporting the bill to create additional Federal circuit and district judges. It is clear that these judgeships are needed. Our court calendars have long been clogged, and it is axiomatic that justice delayed is often justice denied.

We in Alaska are particularly pleased that the bill contains a provision for a second Federal district judge in Alaska. Our statehood bill enacted 2½ years ago provided for only one Federal judge.

Alaska's lone Federal judge has had to hold court in an area larger than falls to the lot of any other Federal judge. Alaska's area of 586,000 square miles is one-fifth the area of the 48 older States. Hearings in Federal cases will have to be held in communities hundreds of miles apart in Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Nome, and perhaps elsewhere.

Apart from the large backlog of existing cases these distances are too great to subject a single district judge to such extensive journeyings.

In the 86th Congress I introduced a bill for the creation of a second district judgeship in Alaska. The second judgeship had the support of the Alaska Bar Association and was endorsed by the Judicial Conference.

But in the last Congress no action was taken to create any new judgeships. In this session the chairman of the Judiciary Committee was gracious enough and appreciative enough of Alaska's problem and need to permit the inclusion of the Alaska judgeship in the omnibus judgeship bill.

Let us hope that the bill will be speedily enacted. We know that it will be signed by President Kennedy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on the judgeship bill, which I shall now make, may be printed as a part of the debate on the subject, as that is the business which is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in January of this year, my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and I introduced proposed legislation to add three additional circuit judges for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in New York, and six additional district judges for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York and two additional district judges for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the statement we issued at that time on this subject may be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT ISSUED BY SENATORS JAVITS AND KEATING

Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republicans, are today introducing in the Senate a bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York.

The bill would provide:

1. Three additional circuit judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

2. Six additional district judges for U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

3. Two additional district judges for U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

A joint introductory statement by Senators JAVITS and KEATING follows:

"The need for additional judges in the second circuit and the southern and eastern districts of New York has been established beyond a doubt. Extensive studies have been conducted not only by the Congress, but by bar associations and other interested private groups. It now takes from approximately 2 years in the southern district to 4 years in the eastern district to reach trial in an ordinary civil case. This certainly cannot be called adequate justice for the litigants involved.

"The proposals for additional judges, which we advocate, are based upon a report of the Judicial Conference of the United States and are actively supported by the bench and bar of the affected jurisdictions.

"Also, these new judgeships were recommended in a joint report by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; New York County Lawyers Association; Bronx County Bar Association; Federal Bar Association (Empire State chapter); the Maritime Law Association of the United States; and New York Patent Law Association. Their report points out that because of the particular location of the southern district, it handles over one-third of all antitrust cases, and almost half of the admiralty cases pending in the entire Nation.

"The size of the six-member Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has not changed since 1938. This proposal would add three additional judges to that court to help cope with the tremendous increase in the court's business.

"For the past 5 years, the number of cases filed per judge in the second circuit, which comprises New York, Connecticut, and Vermont, has been over 50 percent more than the national average. In the first half of the fiscal year 1960, the second circuit had more cases filed with it than any other circuit except the fifth circuit.

"In the eastern district of New York, up to 4 years may pass before a case filed is reached for trial. Periodically, corps of visiting judges have even been enlisted by the eastern district to aid in clearing its congested calendars. The caseload per judge in this district is the highest in the country. By increasing the number of district judges in the eastern district from six to eight, the present caseload per judge would be considerably reduced.

"The southern district of New York is the largest district court in this country. Its calendar on December 31, 1959, represented one-fifth of all of the civil cases pending in the district courts. Yet, the district's 18 judges comprise only one-twelfth of district court judgeships in the 86 Federal districts. Since 1957, the caseload per judge of both civil and criminal cases in the southern district has increased over 10 percent. It is hoped that by increasing the number of judgeships from 18 to 24 in this district that all litigants will be granted a speedy and deliberate determination of their lawsuits.

"Legislation for new judgeships has bogged down before in political controversies about the appointees. The litigant who must wait years to have his case heard is not interested in the political affiliation of the presiding judge, but he is vitally concerned

with his qualifications. To expedite the administration of justice these judgeships should be appointments on merit, and we propose to cooperate toward that end."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, similarly, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made in introducing similar proposed legislation on March 18, 1959, analyzing the condition of congestion of our courts and the workloads of our judges, may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

The enormous caseload imposed upon the judges in these three Federal courts, far in excess of the national average, has resulted in an intolerable situation. Citizens who seek their rights in these courts often experience a delay of up to 4 years between the time their case is filed and final trial. Additional judicial manpower is essential to help assure the prompt administration of justice in the jurisdictional area concerned which is populated by nearly 19 million people.

The omnibus judgeship bill introduced last year by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for the appointment of 34 additional Federal judges including the 7 provided in the bill Senator KEATING and I are introducing today. The proposal for a seventh judge for the second circuit court of appeals was part of a measure first introduced by myself and Senator Ives during the last Congress; this bill was passed by the Senate but not acted upon in the House before adjournment. The longer we delay, the more acute the situation becomes. In the last 4 years, the average number of appeals per judge has soared to 92, practically double the national average of 54. However, it was in 1955, when the caseload was considerably lower, that the Judicial Conference of the United States originally endorsed the need for another judge in the second circuit based on the amount of judicial business then being carried on in this court which covers Vermont and Connecticut as well as New York.

Regarding the additional judgeships required in the eastern and southern districts of New York, a review of other statistics compiled by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, shows that in recent years these two courts have been vying for the unfortunate distinction of having the longest time lag in the entire country for disposition of civil cases settled after trial. Presently, the eastern district has a record delay in such cases of 49.9 months, which is 8 times longer than the 6-month period the Judicial Conference considers reasonable. Under those circumstances, our proposal to increase, from six to eight, the total number of judges in that district seems extremely modest.

We also propose to raise from 18 to 22, the number of judges serving in the southern district of New York. Located in the world's commercial and industrial center, it is the biggest trial court in the entire Federal system, and according to the Senate Judiciary Committee's report in 1957, it has a history best described "only in terms of excessive caseloads, large numbers of protracted cases, a continual accumulation of arrearages and mounting delay." Four more judges would seem to represent a minimum addition in this district, where there was a backlog of over 10,000 cases in 1958, with 578 civil cases pending per judge.

Court reform at all levels has become a major issue in New York State in recent years, where there is growing public awareness and concern that justice delayed for a prolonged period of time is often equivalent to justice denied. Successful efforts have been made to institute more efficient calendar procedures in the southern district, for example, and it is certainly possible that the State legislature will enact comprehensive court reform legislation during the current session. In light of the extensive hearings held by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and its favorable report on a similar Ives-Javits judgeship bill, along with the 4-year-old recommendations of the Judicial Conference, and the mounting impartial statistical evidence from the courts themselves, I hope Congress will act promptly on this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York County Lawyers Association, the Bronx County Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, Empire State chapter, the Maritime Law Association of the United States, and the New York Patent Law Association be printed at this point in my remarks. The report is entitled "Report on the Need for Six Additional Judges for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York."

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

REPORT ON THE NEED FOR SIX ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(Submitted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; New York County Lawyers Association; Bronx County Bar Association; Federal Bar Association (Empire State chapter); the Maritime Law Association of the United States; and New York Patent Law Association)

The bar associations submitting this report are deeply concerned over a threatened breakdown in the administration of justice in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York because of an insufficient number of judges in that court to handle its ever-growing business. Our members, whose practice constitutes the primary work of the court, firmly believe that unless Congress promptly enacts legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York, as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, such a breakdown may occur.

While the need for additional judges is a problem which is not confined to the southern district of New York alone, the southern district is unique in terms of the volume and character of the matters that come before it, and should be treated as such. Not only does this court handle a greater volume of business than any other Federal district court, but, situated as it is at the hub of the Nation's largest economic, shipping and financial center, this court is constantly being called upon to decide matters of vital and unusual importance to the country at large—matters involving more complex and difficult factual and legal problems than those found on the dockets of most other Federal district courts. Such matters, whether disposed of before or after trial, inevitably require more time than the relatively simpler cases that characterize most other Federal dockets.

As of July 1, 1959, out of the Nation's total Federal civil caseload of 56,430[1] cases this district alone had pending before it 10,937 civil, cases. But, as indicated above, bare statistical data concerning the number of cases pending does not give the full measure of judicial output because in this caseload there is an unusually large percentage of highly complicated matters which will take far more time to dispose of than the ordinary cases. This load includes: 33 Government antitrust cases, or over one-third such cases pending in the country; 237 patent suits, constituting almost one-fifth of all such cases in the United States; 2,376 admiralty proceedings (exclusive of Jones Act personal injury cases) representing over two-fifths of all admiralty matters on file in the Federal courts; 117 private antitrust suits, or about 20 percent of all such litigation in the Federal courts, and approximately 25 Robinson-Patman Act cases.[2]

Likewise high is the percentage of other cases that involve complex fields of industry, services and enterprises, ranging from bottled baby foods and bananas to copyright music, watches, radio tubes, computers, television broadcasting, color photography, and prize fight promotion. These suits are of the type referred to colloquially by bench and bar as "the big case." Estimates of trial time required range from several weeks to almost a year per case, and the amounts of damages claimed run in many cases to over a million dollars each.

The implications of this unique type of caseload may be gathered by reference to some examples. In the admiralty field, for instance, the much publicized limitation of liability proceedings affecting the SS *Andrea Doria* and the MV *Stockholm* are recorded statistically as only two cases. However, they actually represent a vast number of separate suits, 1 for each claim, and in these 2 cases there were approximately 3,500 claims filed, many of which involved settlement of infants' and deceased persons' claims.

The recent Bethlehem-Youngstown Steel merger case, a Government antitrust suit tried in the southern district before Judge Edward Weinfeld in 1958, is another typical example. There a motion for summary judgment (see *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 157 F. Supp. 877 for decision) required the court to consider affidavits, exhibits, and briefs exceeding 400 pages. Despite complete cooperation on all sides to shorten the trial through pretrial conferences and stipulations (one of which was 600 pages long) the trial record ran to 12,000 pages and required the judge to spend a very substantial part of 6 months in chambers before handing down an 88-page decision (at 168 F. Supp. 576), plus 199 pages of findings of fact and conclusions of law.

The statistics in the Government suit against the investment bankers, *United States* v. *Henry S. Morgan et al.* (118 F. Supp. 621 (SDNY 1953)), tried before Judge Medina, reveal the true character of the "big case." That case involved 6,848 pages of pretrial depositions, interrogatories, and orders; 10,640 pretrial exhibits, consisting of 43,252 pages; 196 pretrial and interim motions, briefs, and memorandums, plus 376 separate charts and tables prepared by the parties, totaling 3,846 pages; 309 courtroom days of trial, plus 25 days of off-the-record conferences between court and counsel; 23,962 printed pages of trial transcript; 4,469 trial exhibits totaling 20,474 pages plus 2,967 pages marked for identification; 417 pages devoted to the court's opinion.

Yet the Morgan case would be counted as but one case in statistical records.

In his field study of the operations of the U.S. courts (report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959), Mr. Paul J. Cotter stated that "the problem of the complicated case exists to a high degree" in this district, and that it has the largest number of "long and complicated cases" in the country.

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all figures are taken from the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., September 1959.

[2] Estimated by Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan.

Such litigation demands much more of a judge's time and intellect than the hours spent on the trial itself. Before trial the parties usually present difficult factual and legal questions by way of a series of motions accompanied by voluminous papers and briefs which must be studied for a considerable length of time in chambers before they can intelligently be decided. During trial many more hours must be spent analyzing minutes and exhibits and preparing jury charges; and in nonjury cases (which are customary in the complicated patent and admiralty proceedings, and in many antitrust suits) the judge must "after the trial" study the exhibits, transcripts, and briefs before drafting and filing his findings, conclusions, and opinion.

In addition to the many protracted cases on its civil docket, the southern district of New York has also been the venue for an unusually large number of so-called big criminal cases, such as the recently concluded Apalachin trial and the Genovese narcotics case which was tried in April 1959. It should be noted that the southern district handles approximately 1,100 criminal prosecutions annually, which cannot be deferred, since the Constitution guarantees the accused a prompt disposition; and that this consumes the full time of 4 judges, making them unavailable for civil cases.

To handle this enormous and complex caseload, which in sheer numbers constitutes 20 percent of the civil cases pending in all the Federal district courts, Congress has allocated to the southern district of New York only 18 judges, or 7 percent of the total number of Federal district judges in the country. According to the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Warren Olney III, "No district is as undermanned as the southern district of New York."

The 10,937 pending cases in the southern district breaks down to an average of 608 cases pending per judge. There are 12 Federal districts, including the southern district of New York, which have 5 or more judges. All of these districts are located in metropolitan areas and handle approximately 45 percent of all new civil cases filed in the 86 districts having purely Federal jurisdiction.[3]

The average caseload pending before each judge in these 12 districts was 321 cases as of June 30, 1959. In other words, each of the judges in the southern district of New York has on the average almost twice the number of cases pending before him as the judges of these other metropolitan districts. The situation as of June 30, 1958, was much the same: At that time, in the same 12 metropolitan districts, the average number of cases pending per judge was 336, while in the southern district of New York the average caseload per judge was 578. And the average caseload of the judges in all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was 249 and 270 in those years.

Of course, if this unduly large number of cases pending per judge in the southern district of New York could be attributed to inefficiency or a lack of industriousness on the part of its judges, the creation of additional judgeships obviously would not be the solution to the problem. But the record establishes conclusively that this is not the case. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the judges in the southern district of New York on the average disposed of 334 cases per judge, as compared to an average of 253 cases per judge in the 12 metropolitan districts described above. A comparison for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, likewise reveals that the southern district disposed of a substantially greater number of cases per judge than the average of the other metropolitan districts. The average number of cases disposed of per judge for all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was even lower: In 1959 the figure was 236 cases disposed of per judge, and in 1958 the average number of cases disposed of per judge was 231.

Yet, despite the fact that through a prodigious effort the judges in the southern district of New York disposed of a much higher than average number of cases in both 1958 and 1959, their caseload continues to swell: In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, 6,732 [4] new cases were filed in the southern district and 4,896 [4] cases were disposed of. Last year 6,549 new cases were filed and a total of 6,011 cases disposed of. Thus, from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the backlog of pending cases has increased by 2,374 cases in this district even though its judges are working harder than ever. Any further efforts to increase the output per judge pose the risk that judges will be forced unconsciously to sacrifice the quality of justice expected of them in an effort to keep up with the increasing workload. There is a limit to the burden that can be handled efficiently, even by the most conscientious judge. If he exceeds that limit his very attempt to keep up with the excessive burden is self-defeating since mental exhaustion will undoubtedly have an adverse effect upon all of his work, not just the excess.

The steady increase in this district's backlog does not completely reflect the seriousness of the situation. With an inadequate number of judges to handle the entire caseload before it, there is a natural tendency on the part of the court to dispose of the shorter cases first and defer the more complicated and protracted ones, since trial of these cases would consume months of the time of the judges involved and result in a sharp increase in the number of cases forming the backlog. This tendency to handle the shorter cases first, however, increases the hard core of the protracted and complicated cases, especially when one realizes that from 2 to 3 percent of the current filings or approximately 150 new cases each year are of the complicated and protracted type. Recently Chief Judge Ryan has assigned 4 or 5 complicated and protracted cases apiece for all purposes to each of the 18 judges, and we may therefore expect that when trial of some of these cases is commenced in 1960 the delay in handling of regular run-of-the-mill cases will be increased.

Nor have efforts on the part of Congress to stem the engulfing tide of new cases being brought in the Federal courts met with success in the southern district of New York. When Congress passed the Jurisdictional Act of July 25, 1958, which raised the minimum jurisdictional amount from $3,000 to $10,000 in diversity cases, it was anticipated that this would result in a sharp decrease in the number of such cases being brought in the Federal courts, because, of the 67,115 cases filed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, throughout the United States, 25,709 were diversity cases. From the standpoint of the country as a whole, the statute had its desired effect since there was an overall decline of 32.6 percent in the number of such cases filed in the fiscal year 1959. Unfortunately, this decline occurred in districts other than the southern district of New York. In this district, while the number of private civil cases filed in the fiscal year 1959 declined slightly from the previous year (5,388 filed in 1959 as compared to 5,764 filed in 1958), the total number of civil cases commenced in the southern district for 1959 remained substantially the same as it was in 1958; viz, 6,549 as compared with 6,727 [5] Furthermore, an examination of the docket in the southern district for the first 4 months of the current fiscal year (1959–60) reveals that 2,357 new civil cases have been filed, or an average of approximately 600 suits per month, which would mean that we may expect the total for the current year to exceed 7,100 new civil actions.

Thus, while the number of civil actions being commenced in most other districts is on the decline, the number in the southern district of New York is still increasing despite the new act. It should also be noted that the great majority of cases pending in the southern district consist principally of private civil suits rather than suits by or against the Government, a fact of considerable significance in assessing the court's workload, since it is generally accepted that "private civil cases take much more time of the judges than Government cases." [6]

Other new Federal legislation enacted by Congress at its last session may also lead to additional litigation in the southern district of New York. One example of this legislation is the "Labor Management Report and Disclosure Act of 1959" (the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill) enacted in September 1959 (Public Law 86–257) which establishes new controls affecting labor unions and their relationships with union members. Both labor and management representatives have predicted that this act will lead to a flood of litigation by individual union members and employees seeking to enforce rights accorded them under the law. The southern district of New York, which is the situs of the headquarters of many important unions will undoubtedly be invoked in such cases. We may further anticipate that future sessions of Congress will pass additional legislation in other fields that will likewise add to this important court's burden.

What has been the result thus far of this tremendous caseload in the southern district? The median interval between issue and trial in this district during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, was 19.1 months as distinguished from an average median interval of 10.3 months in the 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction. And the time between the filing of a complaint and trial was 26.7 months in the southern district as compared with 15.3 months in these same 86 districts during that same period.

The delay of over 26 months between filing and trial in the southern district causes hardships to litigants and brings the court into disrepute in the eyes of the public. In patent infringement cases, for example, this inordinate delay has serious consequences for it has encouraged willful and wanton infringement of important patents toward the end of their term. Infringers, secure in the knowledge that if suit is brought in the southern district of New York no determination of the issues involved is probable until after the expiration date of the patent, have deliberately embarked on infringement activities toward the end of the term of

[3] These are Massachusetts, the eastern and southern districts of New York, New Jersey, the eastern and western districts of Pennsylvania, the southern district of Florida, the eastern district of Michigan, the northern district of Ohio, the northern district of Illinois, and the northern and southern districts of California.

[4] Field study of the operations of U.S. courts—report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959 (prepared by Paul S. Cotter).

[5] Three hundred and sixty-five civil cases per judge were filed in the southern district in the fiscal year 1959 as compared with an average of 238 such cases per judge in the 12 largest Federal districts in the country (including the southern district of New York).

[6] Quarterly report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for the third quarter of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, p. 8, table C–1; testimony of Warren Olney III, Director, Administrative Office U.S. Courts, Jan. 26, 1959, hearings before the Subcommittee of the House of Appropriations, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (p. 56).

many patents, thus foreshortening the effective term of such patents by several years.

In areas of industry engaged in highly competitive research, patented inventions frequently become obsolete in a matter of years; and in these areas the value of a patent is seriously reduced if speedy relief against infringers is not available, and absent value in the patent, the incentive for invention and development of new products disappears.

But the problem in the southern district of New York is far more serious than one of delay alone. If the present rate of filings continues without abatement, or increases as the first 4 months of 1959–60 indicate will be the case, and the court is given no relief in the form of new judges, we face a deterioration in the very quality of justice that this distinguished court will be able to dispense in the future. Because it is inevitable that when the caseload on the individual judges becomes too heavy, not only does court congestion occur, but the quality of the justice which is dispensed must ultimately be adversely affected.

We believe that this problem cannot be met by measures short of the enactment of legislation creating six additional judgeships. The court has welcomed any reasonable alternative suggestions including the use of visiting judges from other districts and the adoption of various procedural reforms calculated to increase the court's work product. But past experience has shown that the services of visiting judges, although welcomed with open arms, have limited utility since their help is of a temporary and transitory nature and they cannot therefore be assigned to deal with the court's No. 1 problem which is the extraordinary number of complicated and protracted cases pending on its calendar. These judges invariably return after a few weeks to their respective home districts which are often hundreds or thousands of miles from New York. To ask them to continue to handle a matter after they have returned to their home districts would not only be unfair to them and to the lawyers and litigants involved, but would also be impractical.

With respect to procedural reforms, efforts are continually being made toward improving the court's efficiency. These include studies presently underway of measures designed to eliminate waste of time on the part of the court and counsel in the hearing and disposition of motions, and of possible revisions in the court's pretrial procedures. Even with such improvements, however, the court could never expect to increase its already prodigious work product to a point where it could keep abreast of the annual intake of new cases, much less to dispose of the huge backlog of pending litigation before it.

After reviewing the manner in which the present 18 judges are assigned, we are convinced that a minimum of 6 additional judgeships is required to enable the court to keep up with the current annual inflow of civil and criminal business. Any plan for assignment of the 24 judges would still necessitate continuation of the services of retired senior and visiting judges who would be utilized on shorter trials in order to enable a portion of the regularly assigned judges to handle the many complicated and protracted cases instituted in this district. Adequate space and facilities are available to accommodate the six additional judges recommended.

On behalf of our members we urge Congress as strongly as we can to enact promptly legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York before the problem has grown to such gargantuan proportions that the damage will be irreparable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I have no other qualification to be here, I have the qualification of having been a practicing lawyer for many years, and of very extensive experience, especially in the courts. I have tried cases not only in the State and Federal courts of my State; I have tried cases in many States of the United States. I have argued cases on appeal right up to the highest courts. I say advisedly, as a practicing lawyer, that if the public is not outraged, it ought to be outraged, by the way it has been treated in respect to the expansion of the Federal judiciary, particularly since the action we are about to take is long overdue.

Justice delayed has been justice denied, especially in view of the problems which have faced our courts, especially in the busiest jurisdictions of the country, particularly the southern district of New York, and the eastern district of New York, and the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which covers those areas, is absolutely shocking. It would be a national disgrace in any country, and it certainly is in the United States. Not only is this action long overdue; we ought to be apologizing to the country for having "footballed" the judgeship bill around, largely for political reasons, as long as we have.

It is wonderful news to the Federal bench, to State, county, and city bar associations, especially those in the area from which I come, to the member lawyers, and, most important of all, to the citizens who suffer from this denial of the prompt administration of justice, that we are finally about to get it.

No nation can truly assert its adherence to democratic principles when the right to effective judicial remedy is frustrated by delay and inadequate process.

We must go ahead now. We cannot let partisanship or legislative inertia impede us any longer. We must now proceed with all deliberate speed.

The statements and report I have placed in the RECORD contain facts and figures about the way in which citizens have been disadvantaged and victimized, in my opinion, by this denial of prompt justice.

I should like to add one further point. Yesterday the Attorney General of the United States testified before a committee of the other body. We had no hearings before the Senate committee, I am very sorry to say; I wish we had. The Attorney General stated that the best qualified individuals should be selected to fill the vacancies on the bench. As a lawyer and a citizen, I commend the Attorney General for insisting on high and objective criteria in selecting our Federal judges. As a Senator from New York, I am particularly concerned that something be done about the almost impossible workload of the judges in the southern and eastern district courts and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Therefore, together with my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I pledge my efforts to work to assist the Attorney General to attain his objective of getting the best qualified lawyers—and I assume that means without regard to party and without regard to politics—to fill these high and demanding positions of public service.

I shall call upon the people of my State to help, and I shall urge our Bar Associations and other interested civil and professional groups in New York to lend themselves to this vital task, so that when the time comes we can move promptly to name judges who will be a credit to their profession, to their State, and to the principles of equal justice under law promptly administered.

I intend, and I know that my colleague does, too, to take the Attorney General at his word. We will produce the best qualified men. Perhaps he can find others. We want very much to see this standard the one applied in implementing the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I understand that tomorrow the Senate may reach a vote on the bill under consideration, the purpose of which is to establish additional circuit and district judgeships. I hope and expect that the bill will pass by a substantial majority. I assure the Senate that my vote will be cast in the affirmative, because there are few subjects which have come before Congress in the last several years which have been more studied, more surveyed, more researched, and more debated. We have gone through all this before, and indicative of that fact is the comparatively short debate which is now required on this measure.

The senior Senator from New York has just now expressed willingness to cooperate with the Attorney General in selecting from New York, for the New York judicial appointments, the best qualified men available.

If this bill, which provides for another district judge for Alaska, is enacted into law, for my part I should like to offer the Attorney General similar cooperation, to help select from the 49th State the very best available attorney to fill the additional seat on the Federal bench.

Mr. President, perhaps I should speak briefly about the rather unique judicial situation which has prevailed in Alaska. Before the advent of statehood, our Federal district court was empowered by the Congress to deal with both Territorial and Federal matters; and the Territorial judges had primary jurisdiction in all cases, Federal and Territorial.

With the coming of statehood, there was created an Alaska Supreme Court and an Alaska Superior Court.

Both of these courts have now been functioning for more than a year. As a layman, I am informed, by those who are in a better position to know, that the transition from Federal to State judicial administration has proceeded with remarkable efficiency.

Mr. President, what are the facts in regard to the need for another district judge in Alaska? I should say there are several facts which demonstrate the need.

I do not think it necessary at this time to draw a comparison between the num-

ber of Federal cases pending in Alaska and the number of cases which await adjudication in other jurisdictions. However, other elements, especially one very important one, enter into our consideration of the problem in regard to Alaska. That important one is, of course, geographic, because physically it is almost impossible for only one Federal judge to handle the important Federal judicial affairs in our vast State, which is 586,000 square miles in extent—even larger than the State represented by the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY].

The Judicial Conference, in approving the proposal to create another judgeship in Alaska, took this geographic factor into account when it recommended that an additional judgeship be created in Alaska. One Federal judge is simply too burdened to be able to give adequate and proper service to the litigants in so large a State.

Mr. President, let there be no fear that if there be another district judge in Alaska, he will find time hanging heavy on his hands, because only the other day, when I was called upon by Judge Chambers, the chief judge of the Ninth Circuit, he told me that if either of the Alaska judges—assuming that a second one is appointed—finds himself with time on his hands, Judge Chambers will promptly assign that judge to preside in another of the Western States.

In that connection, I wish to compliment the Judicial Conference for the sympathetic attention it has so long demonstrated toward the needs of judicial administration in Alaska. The membership of the Conference has always been most gracious and helpful to us. This latest recommendation is but another example of the appropriate consideration which has been given.

Mr. President, in conclusion. I wish to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks on this subject, a statement presented before the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States, when it met last August, at Seattle. The statement was made by the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, the Federal judge now in Alaska. In his statement, Judge Hodge set forth succinctly and persuasively, in my opinion, the reasons why there should be another Federal judge in the 49th State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF HON. WALTER H. HODGE, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COURT ADMINISTRATION OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES, MEETING AT SEATTLE, WASH., AUGUST 16, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the invitation of this committee to present briefly the case of the need for an additional judge for the district of Alaska pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Judicial Conference of the Ninth Circuit at Pebble Beach, Calif., July 8, 1960.

Reference is made first to some statistical tables furnished by me under date of August 2, 1960, to Mr. Will Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, of which the committee has a copy. These statistics were intended to be supplemental to the statistical information previously furnished by the Administrative Office which is likewise in the hands of the committee. It is conceded that from a purely statistical standpoint the figures do not adequately reflect the need for an additional judge. Figures submitted by our clerk show a total of 264 cases pending as of June 30, 1960, exclusive of bankruptcy and preliminary examinations, of which 223 are civil cases and 41 criminal cases, which is approximately equal to the number of cases transferred to our court on February 20, 1960. This figure is believed to be under the national average and would not be impressive except for the very unusual conditions prevailing in Alaska.

First there was the problem of the very considerable backlog which faced the former U.S. District Court at the time of transition. At that time there was pending in the third division at Anchorage some 2,200 cases and in the fourth division at Fairbanks some 900 cases. The criminal cases had been kept fairly current but the civil cases were far behind, having been pending between date of issue and possible date of trial for as long as 5 years and a great majority of them over 3 years. This was due in large part to the fact that although an additional judge for the third division had been recommended by the Judicial Conference for some 10 years nothing was ever done about it; and by the further fact that from the date of the proclamation of the President admitting Alaska to statehood on January 3, 1959, until the date of the establishment of the new district court on February 20, 1960, no Federal cases had been tried in the fourth division and no Federal civil cases had been tried in the third division. Hence, the backlog referred to reflected seriously upon our initial caseload.

Facing this problem we attempted first to hold pretrial conferences in all civil cases throughout the circuit so far as we could reach them, covering the cases pending at Anchorage up through 1957 and those at Fairbanks through 1958. We were amazed to find that out of 54 such conferences held, only two cases were immediately disposed of, one by confession of judgment and the other by order of the court, which of course is far below the national average. Subsequently a few cases have been settled, possibly as a result of such conferences, and I was informed only last week that two more cases were in the process of settlement. However, most of these cases will need to be tried in addition to those cases not yet reached for pretrial.

The report of the Administrative Office shows an average number of Federal cases commenced in the former district court for the past 3 years as 118 cases, which compares favorably with 55 cases commenced in the first two quarters of our present court. If we add these cases to those pending as of June 30, 1960, we find a total of 382 cases to come before the 1-judge court in 1 year. We found as a result of such pretrial conferences, and trials thus far concluded, that the average length of trial is 3½ days. If all of these cases be tried the time for trial will consume on this basis 924 court days, or at a lesser average of 2½ days per case the time for trial would be 660 court days. The cases mentioned in which settlement is pending would require 3 weeks and 4 days. Last Friday we concluded a brief term at Nome with one civil case consuming 6 full days and a criminal case 3 full days. We hold court ordinarily from 10 a.m. until noon and from 2 p.m. until 5 p.m. for trials and take care of criminal pleas, ex parte matters, hearings on injunctions, etc. at 9:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m., hence our court time generally consumes about 6 hours.

Going back to the history of the matter, I served for some 5½ years on the former district court with headquarters at Nome, but spent over half of my time assisting in the third and fourth divisions at Anchorage and Fairbanks. It was assumed by the four judges that two Federal judges would be provided for the new court. Upon receipt of a copy of the bill which became the Alaska Statehood Act we discovered that only one judge was provided. The act provided that Alaska would constitute one judicial district and that court would be held at Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks and Nome, to which was added Ketchikan by amendment in the Alaska omnibus bill. At that time Alaska had three unofficial delegates at Washington under the "Tennessee plan," one of whom was ex-Governor ERNEST GRUENING, now U.S. Senator from Alaska, who happened to be at Fairbanks. Judge Vernon D. Forbes, and I immediately conferred with Senator GRUENING with respect to amending the bill to provide for two judges.

He took this up with his colleagues and with delegate (now U.S. Senator) E. L. BARTLETT, who advised that the bill had already passed the House committee and that it would be unwise to seek to amend it at such time, suggesting that after statehood we would have two Senators who could then aid in securing an amendment to the act. Senator GRUENING has since introduced a bill in Congress to provide for two judges but it was then suggested that we await some experience record before urging passage of a bill, and Senator GRUENING has been informed that the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States would be necessary. We are not included in the judicial omnibus bill but Senator GRUENING's bill is still pending.

Travel involved is the next most serious problem. Alaska is by far the largest district in the Union, being approximately 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. The distance between Ketchikan, farthest point southeast where the judge is required to hold court, and Nome, the farthest point northwest, is slightly over 1,300 air miles. More appropriately, the distance from our headquarters at Anchorage to the four places where we are required to hold court, as given by the air lines, is as follows: Ketchikan, 768 miles; Juneau, 578 miles; Fairbanks, 263 miles; and Nome, 535 miles. Travel is only by air, except between Anchorage and Fairbanks, where travel may be had by the Alaska Railroad, a trip requiring 12 hours, or by highway, a trip of some 10 hours. We find that the time involved in travel thus far, including our recent trip to Nome, is 15 days, including 3 days on a trip to Ketchikan and return, where I was delayed on account of a snowstorm and held up a full day at Petersburg, which sometimes happens. In addition to actual time of travel, which requires practically a full day, we find another one-half day each necessary in preparation for travel and in setting up court in our new location. It will be observed that up through August we have spent 123 days away from Anchorage. The result of this is that we have no continuity of operation and it is most difficult to set up trial of cases in five remote places.

The cost of travel is also significant, where we find that our cost as extended through September 30, 1960, is $10,839. These costs would not be eliminated by the addition of a second judge but could be substantially reduced. In this connection we find it necessary to take with us our clerk or deputy clerk as an in-court deputy for the reason that at the four places other than Anchorage we have the assistance of the State superior court clerks who also serve

as deputy clerks of our court without compensation[1] and we find that we cannot justly require them to appear in our court. We also need the services of a reporter, my secretary, and a law clerk, whose services I find invaluable in doing research work.

No formal suggestion has been made as yet to my knowledge with respect to divisions of the court but I am of the opinion that no such judicial division should be established but that Congress should provide for two judges for Alaska who may determine their headquarters, and it is my thought that one judge could be stationed at Anchorage to take care of the work there which is approximately 60 percent of our caseload and one at Fairbanks who could handle in addition to the cases from that area the much lighter caseloads at Juneau, Ketchikan, and Nome.

A further problem arises as to the administrative duties. We find it is very time consuming to handle administrative affairs at five different places.

Finally, it is my firm belief that the task cannot be adequately accomplished by one judge. I am not thinking so much of the burden upon the judge as the burden upon litigants who have been long awaiting disposition of their cases. It is disheartening to arrive at Fairbanks and find litigants in tort claims cases awaiting trial for from 3 to 5 years. We have a considerable number of such cases. The same applies to a lesser degree to Miller Act cases. We have many of these due to the vast amount of Government military construction in Alaska. With this more complete picture we submit that the need for an additional judge is urgent. Thank you.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk; and I request its immediate consideration.

I may say that I have cleared this procedure and this action with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and also with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I know of no objection to the action I propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, despite the fact that the committee amendments have not yet been considered?

Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, it is proposed to strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive.

On page 9, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)".

On page 9, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)".

On page 11, immediately before line 4, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 83 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out so much thereof as relates to the eastern district and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(a) The eastern district comprises five divisions:

"(1) The eastern division comprises the counties of Cross, Lee, Monroe, Phillips, Saint Francis, and Woodruff.

"Court for the eastern division shall be held at Helena.

"(2) The western division comprises the counties of Conway, Faulkner, Lonoke, Perry, Pope, Prairie, Pulaski, Saline, Van Buren, White, and Yell.

"Court for the western division shall be held at Little Rock.

"(3) The Pine Bluff division comprises the counties of Arkansas, Chicot, Cleveland, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Grant, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

"Court for the Pine Bluff division shall be held at Pine Bluff.

"(4) The northern division comprises the counties of Cleburne, Fulton, Independence, Izard, Jackson, Sharp, and Stone.

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Batesville.

"(5) The Jonesboro division comprises the counties of Clay, Craighead, Crittenden, Greene, Lawrence, Mississippi, Poinsett, and Randolph.

"Court for the Jonesboro division shall be held at Jonesboro."

On page 11, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 6" and insert "Sec. 7.".

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment I now offer is in the nature of a substitute for the amendment adopted by the Judiciary Committee, concerning the place of holding court for the Western Division of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. The committee amendment provides that the place of holding court for the western division will be at Little Rock and Pine Bluff. Instead of that committee amendment, the amendment I have now offered is to be inserted in the bill at the proper place—not where the present committee amendment is to be found, but on page 12, between lines 3 and 4, I believe.

My substitute amendment would divide the western division of the court into two divisions, one would be called the Pine Bluff division of the court and the other would retain the designation western division.

Mr. President, the western division of the court as currently constituted is by far the most populous division in either of the two Federal judicial districts in Arkansas. As a matter of fact, its present population is approximately 800,000 while the next nearest most-populated division contains some 270,000 people.

The western division is also the largest division areawise, covering almost the entire length of the Arkansas River Valley, which runs from northwest to southeast through the State. Much inconvenience and needless expense thus results to lawyers, witnesses, litigants, who must travel from distant parts of the division to Little Rock, which is the only place that the court presently sits.

To illustrate, a person who lives in Lake Village, in the extreme southeast corner of the division, has a round trip of some 254 miles to Little Rock. If my amendment is adopted and a Pine Bluff division of the court created, his journey would entail only 162 miles, or a saving of some 92 miles of travel.

I may say that one of the district judges of Arkansas now resides in Pine Bluff; and it would be most convenient for the judge who serves in that district to have a division established there, so that court might be held there, not only for the accommodation of the people living in the district, but also as an accommodation to him, and also with some saving in expense to the Government.

Mr. President, there are other considerations that urgently dictate the partition of the western division of the court. We are already witnessing a burgeoning industrial development in the Arkansas River Valley, with its accompanying rapid economic growth and marked increase in litigation in the Federal courts. As work on the Arkansas River development program progresses, this expansion will become even more pronounced. As I have stated, the western division of the court serves this area. The division's geographic jurisdiction is already too extensive and its population is nearly three times as great as that of any other division in Arkansas.

This amendment would simply split the western division in two, taking eight counties in the southeast corner of the western division and one county from the eastern division to form the Pine Bluff division. Court for this new division would be held at Pine Bluff. The other 11 counties presently in the western division would retain the designation "western division," and the place of holding court would remain at Little Rock.

Mr. President, this amendment has the approval of the executive committee of the Arkansas Bar Association and an overwhelming majority of the practicing lawyers in the affected area. If adopted, I am certain it will do much to aid the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, both from an administrative standpoint and in alleviating the crowded condition of its docket. It will also better serve the convenience of the citizens of the area involved.

I know of no opposition. I know of no one interested in this matter other than the people of Arkansas. As one of their representatives in this distinguished body, I urge the immediate adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the leadership on both sides, and especially to the majority leader, for permitting action on the amendment at this time.

THE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL, S. 1021, IN ITS PRESENT FORM WOULD RESULT IN A NET FINANCIAL LOSS TO ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Tuesday, when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon placed the text of the Federal aid to education bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I took the floor

[1] An arrangement was made between the chief justice of the State supreme court as administrative head of the State courts and the Government that the United States would reimburse the State for 10 percent of the salary of the deputy clerks to compensate for their work, but this has not been accomplished and all of the deputy clerks have received a reduction in former salaries.

of the Senate to point out the anomalous situation of Alaska as a beneficiary of the assistance proposed in the legislation recommended by the administration. As a strong supporter of the principle of Federal aid to the Nation's public schools I expressed the dismay of Alaskans who find that the application of the formula proposed for allocation of funds under the bill will supply a negligible amount of assistance to my State.

My concern that this formula be adjusted to achieve an equitable distribution of funds to all 50 States remains undiminished.

However, now that I have had an opportunity to review the full text of the bill which was not available and has now been introduced, and to investigate the effects on Alaska of the proposed amendments to the legislation now existing that extends Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas I find, regretfully, further cause for dismay.

It develops that, in the case of Alaska, legislation to which we have looked forward so long as a means of providing badly needed Federal assistance to our schools will actually mean no assistance at all. In fact, Alaska would, under the proposal of the administration for reducing Federal aid to impacted areas, lose so much money to which it would otherwise be entitled, if the present program were continued on the existing basis, that even with the addition of the $555,000 to which we would be entitled in the first year under the Federal aid provisions of title I, we would wind up with a deficit for the 1962 fiscal year of nearly $70,000.

So, instead of gaining aid for education we would lose much of the assistance we have been receiving since enactment of the legislation for federally impacted areas, and on which our schools are quite dependent.

The program under which Federal assistance is channeled to schools in areas in which the Federal Government has large establishments is essential to the public schools of Alaska. Our local school districts and the State, which operates schools in large areas of the State that are not organized in school districts, cannot undertake the burden of educating the children of personnel stationed at the large Air Force bases and Army installations at Anchorage and Fairbanks. If the children whose parents are employed at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson at Anchorage or at Fort Jonathan Wainwright and Eielsen Air Force Base near Fairbanks or at Fort Greely, are to be educated, the Federal Government must continue to provide assistance on the same scale at which it has been provided during past years, or, in the alternative, there must be a far more generous program of Federal aid to education than that proposed in S. 1021, or at least a more realistic apportionment formula for Alaska.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, who serves so ably as chairman of the Education Subcommittee and as manager of this important legislation, stated on Tuesday, Alaska is one of the great defense areas of the United States. I believe the responsibility of the United States for the maintenance of this bulwark of strength extends to the education of the children of those who maintain these defenses, and that this responsibility has in no way diminished. Certainly, in Alaska there is no decrease in the impact of Federal activity on local facilities which would justify any decrease at all in the funds available to the State for education of personnel employed at Federal Government installations.

Believing, as I do, that the program of Federal aid to impacted areas is as important as it ever was, I commend my able and distinguished colleague from California, Senator ENGLE, on his introduction of legislation which would extend the program in its present form on a permanent basis. In view of the needs of Alaska for this continued assistance, I shall support his proposal with enthusiasm.

I remain firm in my support of the principle of Federal aid to local schools for purposes for which it is needed, whether it be construction of classrooms or payment of teachers' salaries. What must be done, however, is to achieve Federal legislation which will provide the assistance that is needed on the scale at which it is required.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary is to be congratulated on its dispatch in reporting to the Senate S. 912, the omnibus judgeship bill. I am especially preciative of the committee's action in amending S. 912 to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for my State of California, two for the northern district and two for the southern district.

California is a growing State and the need for these new judgeships is manifest. I call to the attention of the Senate the excellent material in support of the new California judgeships included in the comprehensive committee report accompanying S. 912, Senate Report No. 55. The number and the character of the cases coming before judges in both divisions demand the assistance which would be provided by the bill as reported from the committee. The Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on February 6, 1961, unanimously recommended the increase, and the State bar of California recently reiterated its support. Its resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Board of Governors of the State bar of California earnestly recommends for favorable consideration by the Congress of the United States the proposal to add two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California and to add two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

I urge my colleagues to take note of the urgent need for these additional judgeships and to accept the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a telegram sent to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts by Richard H. Chambers, chief judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; also, a memorandum supplied by Chief Judge Louis E. Goodman, of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

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

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 6, 1961.*
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS,
Washington, D.C.:

Judicial Council, Ninth Circuit, today unanimously recommended increase in number of district judges for the State of Washington from four to five judges, in southern district of California from 11 to 13 and the northern district of California from 7 to 9.

RICHARD H. CHAMBERS,
Chief Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

MEMORANDUM

In re need of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California for two additional district judges

Almost 6 years ago (85th Cong., 1st sess.), after a favorable recommendation by the Judicial Conference of the United States, legislation was proposed in the Senate (S. 1256) authorizing one additional judgeship for the Northern District of California.[1] The Judicial Conference of the United States, through the administrative office, submitted statistical data showing the need at that time for this additional judgeship. The Congress has not as yet taken any action with respect to this additional judgeship, as well as for additional judgeships in other districts throughout the country. In the meantime the need for additional judicial manpower in the northern district of California has become increasingly acute. Both the population, and the business of the court, have been steadily increasing. There is now a need for two additional judgeships instead of the one which was necessary over 6 years ago.

In 1959 there were a total of 2,255 cases filed in the northern district, or 322 cases per judge. However, statistics relating to the number of cases are inadequate to picture the nature of the business of the court. For example, we have approximately 30 large private antitrust cases which numerically make up only a little over 1 percent of the total filings, and yet these cases occupy a very large percentage of court time. On the criminal side in our southern division, we have had, and are continuing to have, many long criminal cases.

We have a very difficult administrative problem with respect to the functioning of our northern division in which one judge sits in Sacramento. In the northern division there are a great many condemnation cases, inasmuch as the Government has condemned many large tracts of land for dam sites, water development, military installations, and the like. The business of the northern division is far more than a single judge can handle. Consequently, we have almost continuously been required to

[1] The last previous increase in judicial personnel was in 1949, when two additional judgeships were authorized by Congress. The need for the additional judgeship provided for in S. 1256 was demonstrated several years prior to 1955. (See proceedings of the Judicial Conference, 1954 sess.).

obtain help of outside judges to sit in Sacramento. Occasionally, one of our judges from the southern division sits in Sacramento to help out, but this has been a difficult procedure in view of the pressure of business in the southern division. The northern division needs an additional judge, as does the southern division. The records of the administrative office show the large number of judges, over the last few years, who have been assigned from out of State to sit in California.

Therefore, it is our view, resulting from the day-to-day handling of the business of the court, that in order to accomplish effective administration of both divisions of the court, that we should have two additional judges, one to serve in the northern division, and one to serve in the southern division.

LOUIS E. GOODMAN,
Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

THE B–70 INTERCONTINENTAL BOMBER PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last year, upon the insistence of Congress and the obvious concern of the public over the state of our national defenses, the Eisenhower administration reinstated the B–70 intercontinental bomber to a full weapon system development program. Since then the drift of events has caused renewed apprehension over this vital defense weapon. I rise now to remind this body of the vital importance of this program, as impressed upon us by key military witnesses last year, and to make inquiry about its present status.

Mr. President, in June 1960, Congress added $190 million to the $75 million budgeted for the B–70 in the 1961 fiscal year by the Eisenhower administration. It was clearly the sense of Congress that curtailment of the B–70 by the administration in 1959 was not in the interests of the Nation's defense. We felt that this program which had always been fully supported by Congress should be put back on the track without further delay.

This step was taken after extensive hearings on the subject in both Houses. It was prompted by testimony from our top military officers to the effect that a strong force of B–70's is absolutely essential to the Nation's defense and security posture in the years ahead.

The administration tacitly admitted that Congress had been right all along when it finally released $155 million 9 days before the November election.

Yet while we were gratified to see this new lease on life for such a critical weapon, the fact was that the Eisenhower administration still did not release all the funds Congress had appropriated. It is my understanding that the additional $100 million has not been used for fighters. It is therefore available for the B–70, but it is not being used for that program either In addition, the Eisenhower budget recommendation for the 1962 fiscal year specified only $354 million for the B–70.

I think you will agree with me that these developments are cause for apprehension. With a first flight date scheduled late next year, we are approaching the period of peak expenditure for the B–70 if we are serious about putting this formidable weapon into the military inventory. Any realistic cost schedule that I have seen for timely development of the B–70 program calls for a substantially higher expenditure at this stage.

Mr. President, I had supposed that the future of the B–70 was settled last year. But it appears necessary to inquire over again: Are we really for the B–70? If not, what has happened to change our minds? Or, if so, are we doing all that we can to speed it to completion and operation?

After the extensive hearings on the B–70 last year, and the very thorough and authoritative report on the subject by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's Preparedness Subcommittee, it would hardly seem necessary to review the arguments for the B–70. I have stood here before, and so have a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, outlining the need for this vital program. It is, therefore, only out of a sense of urgency that I refer once again to the key role of the B–70 in our defense and security posture.

The B–70 is an intercontinental bomber capable of cruising throughout its mission at 2,000 miles per hour or three times the speed of sound, and at altitudes up to more than 70,000 feet. It has been conceived and developed to give the Air Force the continued flexibility and versatility inherent in a mixed force of both manned and unmanned weapons. Such a mixed force exists today, but through normal technical evolution its weapons will become obsolete. It is specifically for the purpose of maintaining an effective mixed force beyond the mid-1960's that the B–70 was created. It is, in the field of manned weapons, what the Minuteman is in the field of ICBM's.

Mr. President, neither the concept of the B–70 nor its ability to fulfill this concept have ever been refuted. Yet we continue to hear the same kind of vague objections that have been cast at aircraft and airpower since the days of Gen. Billy Mitchell—or more accurately, since the Wright brothers. These objections are usually tossed off in a sweeping and generalized manner, because they cannot get specific without facing the facts. Old and decrepit as they are, they keep turning up with each new generation of aircraft like a long-whiskered joke.

For example, there is the objection that the B–70 is competitive with other weapons. I am sure that when the first bomb was dropped by hand from a Wright biplane in 1911, somebody objected that this was competitive with artillery shells. In answer to the present version of this absurdity, I will merely describe one of the many B–70 capabilities that are unique, and which offer a dimension of military security not provided by the whole family of ballistic missiles. I refer to the way in which the B–70 greatly upgrades the Nation's ability to perform one of the most difficult functions of defense—the decision to retaliate, including precisely where to retaliate.

By the mid-1960's—barring atomic disarmament—the number of nations with nuclear striking power will be noticeably greater, thus compounding the danger of accidental, irresponsible attack. In this charged atmosphere, the problem of dealing with false or unconfirmed warnings is also multiplied. In the event of a warning, a nation armed with missiles alone cannot get its weapons off the ground until it gets more information: Is the warning false or real? Which nation launched the attack? What degree of counterattack is called for?

Gathering such information takes time. In the confusion of such an agonizing moment, the chances are small of our getting this necessary information and making the decision before it is too late. Knowing this, another nation bent on overawing the rest of the world might reasonably count on our reluctance to decide on an irrevocable counterattack. So far as the ICBM is concerned, the very nature of the weapon gets in the way of the decision.

The B–70, however, overcomes this obstacle by separating the decision from the response. Since it is under positive human control at all times, it may be recalled if the information indicates a false alarm. It can, therefore, respond instantly to the unconfirmed warning—getting clear of its base and safely aloft. The decision whether to carry through the counterattack or recall the bombers can be made any time during their intercontinental flight, and can even be delayed while the B–70's are loitering short of the enemy frontier. With this weapon, our ability to deter a war is not limited by the difficulty of making a decision.

Nor is its security dependent upon the complete success of our warning system. The B–70 is fully capable of being maintained on air alert, thus removing all chance of its being destroyed on the ground. I know of no other weapon system which, either in its initial operation or in its growth potential, is so secure against surprise attack.

Another familiar-sounding argument against the B–70 is that a target cannot be seen or hit from 70,000 feet. The granddaddy of this objection was hurled at Billy Mitchell until he went out and sunk a few surplus battleships in 1921 and 1923.

The truth is that the B–70's advanced bombing-navigation system not only permits us to double the altitude of our bombers without loss of accuracy, but in several particulars provides better performance than ever before. Its accurate guidance equipment actually eliminates any significant navigational error in approaching the bomb release point. Its extremely high resolution radar greatly increases the probability of recognizing obscure targets. And it has a number of alternate methods of operation to assure a high probability of success despite unforeseen circumstances.

More than this, even in future years many types of targets could not be destroyed by ballistic missiles, and would be invulnerable if we do not have the B–70. These include mobile targets such as movable missile launchers, which will

come increasingly into use in the late 1960's. They include the many targets whose global coordinates are not precisely known. They include targets which are close to friendly borders or populations, and which can only be safely attacked by weapon systems with on-the-spot human observation and control. They include heavily shielded targets, such as underground command centers, which require the extremely heavy-yield warheads that can only be delivered by a manned bomber.

Then there is the claim that the B–70 cannot get through to its targets. This old canard goes back at least to 1942, when it was said that our heavy bombers could not get through to bomb Germany in daylight.

Mr. President, the Air Force states that the B–70 will not only be competitive with the Soviet air defenses which will be developed by the last half of this decade, but that it will force that development at a disproportionate cost to the Soviets and at the expense of their strategic striking force. The present Soviet air defenses will be utterly inadequate against a mach 3 B–70. An anti-ICBM system, operating on the principle of predicting the trajectory, would be absolutely unsuitable against a maneuverable manned weapon.

Unless they are willing to jeopardize the mastery of their own skies, the Soviets must build an altogether new defense system. This new system must include four elements of air defense—interceptors, ground-to-air missiles, radar warning systems, and the complex communication and control systems required to operate them. Since the B–70 vastly shortens the time in which the defender can make decisions and implement those decisions, the Soviets must largely abandon manual weapon control and adopt automatic methods on the order of a super SAGE system. And because such systems would be open to disruption by our attack, the defenders must provide considerable duplication.

This sort of effort clearly calls for an enormous expenditure. The Strategic Air Command has estimated that the Soviets would have to spend at least $40 billion on a system that would be competitive with the B–70. This is the real payoff—the real bargain—in the B–70 program. While we spend money on the B–70 at the billion dollar level, the Soviets must spend it in tens of billions—and then achieve a system that is merely competitive, not superior. For the penetration achieved through the B–70's extreme speed and altitude will be augmented by evasive tactics and by a defensive countermeasure system which incorporates all the latest electronic devises to divert and confuse the enemy.

I need not remind this body that the Soviets are spending a much larger proportion of their gross national product on military preparation than is the United States. We hear it reported by experienced observers that the Soviets cannot increase this proportion at the expense of consumer goods without risking dangerous dissatisfaction among the people. Whatever additional funds they are forced to spend on defensive measures must come out of, and cause a reduction in, their offensive potential.

In short, the strategic effect of the B–70 is twofold: It helps mightily to deter an attack by assuring the Soviets of powerful retaliation; and by forcing on them a diversion of funds to defensive measures, it helps to reduce their capacity to attack. I submit that this is an end supremely worth achieving for the safety of this country and of the world.

Mr. President, I believe that I have said enough about the objections which mysteriously persist against the B–70. You will note that, like a band of guerrilla fighters, they simply fire their volley and then run for cover to avoid an open examination of the facts. Their natural habitat is the sweeping generality, the clever innuendo, and the unconfirmed rumor. During the liftime of the B–70 program thus far, they have periodically turned up with a claim that because of such and such a technical breakthrough, the B–70 is done for. Each time, calm appraisal has demonstrated that, through simple tactics or small design features, these horrible bogies can be chased back into the shadows from whence they came.

I am convinced that, as surely as Halloween comes around each year, they will pop up again in new disguises. And I feel very strongly that it is the duty of public servants concerned with the national defense to bring these goblins under the corner lamppost and subject them to careful scrutiny.

If there had been any repudiation of the B–70 by the military experts in whom we have deposited our trust in this specialized field, I would not now rise in genuine concern over its status. On the contrary, the Air Force has been singularly consistent in its enthusiasm for this weapon and its insistence that the B–70 is essential to our military posture.

On the basis of this advice, Congress has repeatedly provided the necessary funds to push this program through to operational status as swiftly as possible. Yet despite all that can be said and done, the position of the B–70 program still seems—at least from outward appearances—to be almost as vague and uncertain as the previous administration attempted to make it.

We have been through all this before, Mr. President. I have the feeling as I stand here that this is where I came in. I believe it is time once again to ask, openly and apprehensively: What is the status of the B–70? Is it being fully funded? Are we making certain that it will have the place in our security and in that of the free world that is so urgently needed?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF NORMAN CLAPP TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to endorse the nomination of a distinguished Wisconsin citizen, Norman Clapp, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. Clapp has a fine record of public service and devotion to rural electrification, and he is superbly qualified to provide wise leadership in his new position.

Norman Clapp was born at Ellsworth, Wis. He attended Lawrence College, in Appleton, where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. While still in college, his abilities were recognized by my predecessor, the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., who brought him to Washington as his administrative assistant.

Senator La Follette was a spearhead in Congress for the then young REA, and Mr. Clapp was instrumental in getting the program in Wisconsin off to a sound start in that incubation period.

For 14 years following 1944, Norman Clapp edited and published the Grant County Independent and the Muscoda Progressive, in Wisconsin. Through his newspapers, he maintained his close interest with the REA programs. In editorials he urged electric cooperative members to be concerned about REA matters in other States.

One of his editorials, a tribute to the Grant Electric Cooperative, won the 1952 Wisconsin Press Association award for the best agricultural editorial appearing in a State newspaper.

He twice ran for election to the U.S. Congress from the Third District of Wisconsin. He was not elected; but the dignity and integrity of his campaigns reaffirmed his fine reputation in Wisconsin. He never stooped to political trickery, and he ignored "easy" issues, even though that may have cost him some votes.

He is a brother of Gordon Clapp, former General Manager and Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Norman Clapp's appointment to head the REA has been endorsed by the National Rural Electrical Cooperative Association, representing over 900 rural electric cooperatives. At their annual meeting in Dallas, on February 13 to 16 of this year, the NRECA adopted a resolution in support of his nomination.

The general manager of this group, Mr. Clyde Ellis, has also given Norman Clapp his personal endorsement. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution and Mr. Ellis' statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY MR. CLYDE T. ELLIS, GENERAL MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRICAL COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, AT 19TH ANNUAL MEETING IN DALLAS, FEBRUARY 16, 1961

What I want to say here in about 2 minutes is in the nature of a response and to make an important announcement.

On behalf of our fine officers of our great board, and on behalf of you and of myself, I want to thank the next REA Administrator, Mr. Clapp, for accepting our invitation to come to Dallas to be with us. I think these days of close association have gotten him off to a good start with you, and you with him.

I have been very favorably impressed with the sincerity, energy, and obvious ability of the new Administrator. Many times during these days he has expressed his desire to work with you and with us to revitalize the REA program.

For NRECA, for all of us and particularly for our staff in Washington, I want to assure you, Mr. Clapp, that we shall use the resources of this great organization to aid you in the monumental task that lies ahead. We want to work with you to give you the benefits of NRECA's 18 years of experience in this program. You have stated your objectives for REA and your intention to work with us in an admirable manner. We are ready and eager to do everything we can to help you in achieving those worthy and noble objectives.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION

(Adopted by the membership of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in general session, at Dallas, Tex., February 16, 1961)

Whereas President Kennedy's statements on the rural electrification program show his understanding and sympathy for the hard tasks ahead: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our gratitude and appreciation for his open and firm support of this great program; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our appreciation for the appointment of a friend of rural electrification, Norman Clapp, of Wisconsin, as REA Administrator, and we urge the Senate to confirm his appointment without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our appreciation for the appointment of a longstanding pioneer worker in the rural electrification program, Richard A. Dell, as Deputy Administrator of REA.

MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, less than 8 weeks remain before the act terminating the Federal status of the Menominee Indian community in Wisconsin is scheduled to take effect. The final date is April 30.

A delegation from the tribe has been in Washington for some time to express the tribe's considered opinion that unless their financial situation is greatly improved, and unless their enterprises, governmental organization, and holdings are well established, the termination program cannot work out successfully. It is my understanding that the tribe has taken all the steps prescribed by law to achieve an orderly transition. But this does not erase the hard fact that unless a much better economic base is placed under all their operations, the termination will result in serious and predictable hardship.

Several weeks ago I wrote to the Secretary of Interior, asking him to undertake a sympathetic review of the tribe's situation. I sent him copies of the two bills, S. 869 and S. 870, which I have introduced, and asked him to report on these as soon as possible. Since that time the Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Gaylord A. Nelson, has also written Secretary Udall, to support the bills which I have introduced.

In his letter, Governor Nelson states that termination on April 30 may result in a chaotic situation which could eliminate any possibility of a successful development of the Menominee community. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week the tribal delegates wrote to the Secretary, asking that an on-the-spot appraisal of the tribe's current situation be made. I fully support this request, and join in their hope that such a new field investigation will be undertaken at once, if it has not already begun.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the tribal delegates to Secretary Udall also be printed in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 23, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you are aware, the Menominee Indians, under the existing Termination Act, Public Law 399, as amended, provides for termination of Federal supervision over the tribe as of April 30, 1961.

In assessing the chance of its success, the Menominee Tribe is very apprehensive of the outcome since the basic industry upon which future taxes must be derived is from the timber and lumbering enterprise, now at its lowest market. In view of these disturbing factors, there have been introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4130 by Congressman LAIRD, of Wisconsin. Identical bills have been introduced in the Senate, S. 869 and S. 870, by Senators PROXMIRE and WILEY, of Wisconsin. These bills are designed to relieve the situation affecting the tribe.

In the past several days conferences have been held with Assistant Secretary Carver, the Indian task force, and the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the undersigned tribal delegates on the termination problem, as well as other phases of our economic collapse. We cannot foresee a stable economy on the Menominee Reservation for several years which must carry the responsibilities connected with local government in the form of tax revenues. In the light of the many social and economic problems not yet resolved, it is our prayerful request that the task force or its chairman be assigned to the Menominee Reservation to make an on-the-spot appraisal of the termination program and its impact on the existing economy of the tribe and such task force to recommend such other means necessary for an orderly termination of the Menominee Tribe.

We sincerely believe it will be to the best interest of the tribe, as well as the Government, that such survey be conducted immediately and prior to submission of departmental reports on the bills mentioned herein. The termination date is fast approaching and it is reasonable to assume the Government has a moral responsibility to see that the Menominee Tribe has a chance in this pilot experiment.

Therefore, again we request respectfully that the new personnel under the task force be made available to the Menominee Tribe to conduct such survey in the interest of an honest approach to our problem.

Very respectfully submitted.

JEROME GRIGNON,
AL M. DODGE,
Tribal Delegates.

EXHIBIT I

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, February 23, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: I strongly urge you to support the legislation now pending (S. 869 and H.R. 4130) which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to extend the date of termination of the Menominee Reservation. Advisers in my office and the State agencies which will be affected by the termination inform me that termination of the reservation on April 30 may result in a chaotic situation which could eliminate any possibility of a successful development of the Menominee community.

I also support and urge serious consideration of S. 870, by Senators PROXMIRE and WILEY. This legislation would permit an orderly transition from the present Federal jurisdiction over the Menominee Reservation to full incorporation of the reservation into the State government structure.

Neither the leadership of the Menominees nor officials of the State of Wisconsin want to avoid a final termination of Federal jurisdiction. We do feel, though, that execution of the present law is not in the best interest of the Menominees, the State government, or the Federal Government.

Your assistance in these matters will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

GAYLORD A. NELSON,
Governor.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, anyone who has scrambled hurriedly for detailed impartially accurate, and complete information on any legislative subject has undoubtedly turned to the Congressional Quarterly as one of the first and best sources. In addition to providing weekly summaries of the happenings in Congress, the publishers of CQ also from time to time prepare and publish in the publication known as Editorial Research Reports more extensive studies of problems and issues of major consequence.

The latest such study, issued on February 8 of this year, is entitled "City Traffic Congestion." It is a valuable and concise description of the problem that prompted me to introduce last year S. 3278, to help improve mass transportation service in our urban and metropolitan areas. That bill was passed by the Senate, with broad bipartisan support, after extensive hearings by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The record of those hearings is studded with a great amount of information that should concern all of us, given the knowledge that "transportation is at the heart of urban problems," as the study notes.

This year, on January 11, I introduced together with 17 of my colleagues, a revised and expanded version of last year's

bill, on the basis of my study of last year's record and consultation with a number of experts in the field. This bill, S. 345, comes more closely to grips with what the report describes as one of the major obstacles to effective action—namely, the fragmentation of political jurisdictions in metropolitan areas.

S. 345 authorizes planning grants for the preparation of comprehensive mass transportation plans for urban areas as a whole, with a directive to the Administrator of the program to encourage such participation and cooperation as is necessary to insure maximum area-wide support for the plans. In addition, in extending loans for the construction or improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment, the Administrator is directed to give priority to applicants making substantial progress in achieving a positive, workable program. This workable program includes not only the preparation of comprehensive area-wide land use and mass transportation plans; it also includes the development, where necessary, of the financial administrative, and organizational measures needed to equitably provide mass transportation service for the area as a whole.

After 3 years, no assistance would be extended unless substantial progress of this kind had been made in the area to be benefited.

These provisions, I believe, offer the greatest hope for overcoming, in the long run, the obstacle of political fragmentation, keeping in mind that there is urgent need for immediate short-run assistance to many areas faced with a serious deterioration or collapse of existing service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Editorial Research Report on "City Traffic Congestion," prepared by Helen B. Shaffer, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EDITOR'S RESEARCH REPORTS

(By Helen B. Shaffer)

CITY TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Worsening of traffic congestion on city streets, despite extensive construction of motor freeways and introduction of modern traffic control measures, is apparent in almost every big American community. Municipal authorities thus are being forced to consider expansion of mass transportation facilities as a means of reducing the number of cars and the traffic jams on urban thoroughfares.

Private interests, however, are hesitant about investing large capital sums in a type of enterprise which generally has not yielded satisfactory returns in recent years, and the cities themselves have had only limited capacity to establish or extend publicly owned transit systems. The problem is complicated by doubts as to whether suburbanites, if offered swift and frequent public service, could be drawn out of their cars and into buses or trains in sufficient numbers to dispel what is fast becoming a transportation crisis. Proposals to discourage use of private automobiles in city traffic by banning them from downtown areas or by imposing special new tax levies on motorists have met stiff opposition.

Virtually all studies of urban traffic questions have concluded that the cities urgently need a balanced expansion of facilities for both private and public transportation. But there is little agreement on what constitutes a balanced program in a given situation. Effective planning is hampered by a tug-of-war between pro-automobile and pro-rapid-transit groups. Fragmentation of political jurisdiction in metropolitan areas raises another obstacle.

The Federal Government is being drawn increasingly into the urban traffic problem. The Kennedy administration is committed to Federal aid to metropolitan areas, possibly through a new Department of Urban Affairs. All experts agree that transportation is at the heart of urban problems. A bill to provide Federal aid for urban transportation planning and mass transit development was approved by the Senate last year and a similar measure was introduced a few days after the 87th Congress convened this year.

Overloading of streets in fast-growing cities

The Senate Banking Committee reported last June 15, after hearings on the urban transportation bill, that "the United States today is in the throes of an urban transportation crisis * * * shaped by the rapidly increasing concentration of vehicles and people in the metropolitan areas * * * and a concomitant decline and deterioration of mass transportation." The committee concluded that unless the trend could be reversed, the metropolitan areas appeared "destined for a total breakdown of their transportation networks." Steps taken to increase road capacity have not kept pace with increased use of automobiles. Construction of expressways leading into the cities has encouraged the influx of cars into downtown streets too narrow to handle the traffic load.

Changing patterns of population are at the root of city traffic jams. At the turn of the century only 24 million Americans, less than one-third of the country's population, lived in metropolitan areas, and those areas did not extend far beyond the city proper. Today 109 million persons, two-thirds of the population, reside in metropolitan areas that stretch 15 or more miles beyond the limits of the central city. Every year the metropolitan areas take in a million acres more and add 3 million people to their total population. By 1970, when it is estimated that the country's population will reach 215 million, four-fifths will be concentrated in metropolitan areas.

Clustering of people around the cities has been accompanied by a decline in patronage of mass transportation facilities.[1] To make up the resulting loss of revenue, transit companies have increased fares and reduced service, thereby encouraging a further shift to private transportation. Extension of regular transit service to new suburbs, where virtually every family owns at least one car, has proved unprofitable. Meanwhile, the clogging of city traffic has lowered the efficiency of public transit operation. Because most of the Nation's future population growth is expected to occur in the metropolitan areas, some cities expect a doubling of auto traffic within the next 20 years—unless more people can be induced to use public transit.

Incipient resistance to invasion of motorcars

In a report titled "Rationale of Federal Transportation Policy," the Department of Commerce said last April: "Merely adding highways which will attract more automobiles which will in turn require more highways is no solution to the problems of urban development." Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, reviewing efforts by that State to relieve traffic jams in major metropolitan areas, similarly told a Senate Banking Subcommittee on May 24: "Highway capacity has been expanded. A third tube of the Lincoln Tunnel [into New York City] has been opened. The Port [of New York] Authority has improved bus commuting facilities. An extra bridge between Philadelphia and Camden has been added. But traffic congestion worsens every day."

A recent report on traffic in Atlanta, where six interstate expressways converge on the downtown area, noted that one portion of a 6-lane expressway already had a traffic load that would warrant 16 lanes, and that expected population growth indicated a need 20 years hence for 36 lanes. "By no stretch of the imagination," a Georgia planning official testified before the Senate subcommittee, "is it physically or financially possible to build such a facility."

Municipalities are beginning to resist the automobile's continuing demand for more space. Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze, of Cleveland, told the subcommittee that a 3½-mile freeway, which cost $75 million, took $30 million worth of property off the city's tax rolls. Other municipal authorities complained that city parks were being torn up for parking lots and garages. Mayor Raymond Tucker, of St. Louis, testifying as president of the American Municipal Association, said that "Unless drastic steps are taken to move an increasing number of our people conveniently and pleasantly by mass transportation the private automobile will cease to be a convenient method of transportation."

"The plain fact of the matter is that we just cannot build enough lanes of highway to move all of our people by private automobile and create enough parking space to store the cars without completely paving over our cities and removing all of the * * * economic, social, and cultural establishments that the people are trying to reach in the first place. * * * Even if we could do it physically, the costs would bankrupt the combined resources of city, State, and Federal Government. It is incontestable * * * that we must find ways * * * of moving more * * * people by some form of mass transportation."

Two-thirds of downtown Los Angeles, which expects a population growth of 1½ million in the next decade, is occupied by roads, highways, parking lots, and garages. Fifty-six percent of downtown Detroit is devoted to automobile-serving facilities. Even Manhattan, which still relies heavily on mass transit despite mounting auto traffic, devotes one-third of its downtown land to transportation.

Revival of interest in rail rapid transit lines

A marked decline in the quantity and quality of commuter rail service, once the major means of transport between the older cities and their suburbs, has contributed significantly to city traffic congestion. Insufficient maintenance, deteriorating equipment, reduced schedules, and finally total abandonment of service have characterized rail commuter systems in recent years. The condition has been attributed largely to loss of the freight traffic which once compensated for the historically unprofitable, twice-a-day commuter runs. The decline of commuter service was hastened by provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958 which authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to allow railroads to terminate unprofitable runs regardless of State laws or decisions to the contrary.[2]

[1] The number of passenger trips on all forms of transit dropped from 19 billion in 1945 to 7.6 billion in 1959. According to the American Transit Association, 119 transit companies ceased operations between Jan. 1, 1954, and Sept. 1, 1959; 49 of the systems were taken over by other operators.

[2] In New Jersey alone the number of passenger trains in operation fell from 1,113 to 865 after the 1958 act was adopted.

Every abandonment of a commuter run increases the volume of bus or, more frequently, private automobile travel into and out of the central city and so adds to urban traffic congestion. Mayor Robert F. Wagner told the Senate Banking Subcommittee on May 23 that it would be "just chaos for us in the city of New York to attempt * * * to handle the tranportation problem unless these commuter railroads are healthy and operating." An executive of the Metropolitan Regional Council [3] said that if only the trains linking New York with Westchester County suburbs were dropped, the city would have to provide an additional 250 acres of space in downtown Manhattan to accommodate the increased automobile traffic. "We just do not have 250 acres of space," he added.

Growing appreciation of such factors is giving rail service for commuters, and for intracity travelers, a fresh and increasing appeal to urban authorities. Even cities which have never relied on service of this kind, or cities which have long since abandoned it, are putting rail transit, either subway or surface, in their blueprints for future area development.

The California Legislature created the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District in 1957 to develop plans for a five-county system of rail transit; current plans call for approximately 130 miles of rail lines connecting population centers in and around San Francisco. Similar plans are underway for Los Angeles.

A comprehensive plan for transportation development in Washington, D.C., proposes construction of four high-speed subway and surface rail lines in addition to new freeways for private automobiles and express buses. A temporary National Capital Transportation Agency, created by Congress last July, was directed to give special consideration to early building of a subway linking the city's union rail terminal with the main business and Government office district. The Metropolitan Commission for Atlanta, created by the Georgia Legislature, has concluded that some form of rapid transit must be introduced in that area.

The attraction of rail service lies in its efficient use of space for fast transport of large numbers of people. It has been estimated that it would take up to 20 lanes of highway—some estimates say more—to transport by automobile the number of people who can be carried on a double-track rail line. The American Municipal Association, after surveying mass transportation facilities in Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, and Philadelphia, estimated that it would cost $31 billion to build the additional highways that would be needed if these cities lost the rail commuter services they have now.

Development from scratch today of municipal subway systems, or rail rapid transit lines extending into outlying suburbs, would require very heavy capital investment. And it is doubtful whether new systems of this kind, operating with heavy loads at best no more than twice a day, 5 days a week, could return a profit. Nathan Cherniack, economist of the Port of New York Authority, told a highway research board meeting in Washington on January 12, that most cities would have to subsidize their passenger transportation lines if they were to give the public adequate service.[4]

[3] A body of elected officials representing Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York cities and counties in the New York metropolitan area.

[4] Modern automobile freeways also require large capital investment. The mass transportation plan proposed for Washington, D.C., in 1959 called for rail rapid transit facilities estimated to cost $458.5 million; but freeway, parkway, and major street improvements also described as essential were estimated to cost $1.8 billion. The chairman of the Chicago Transit Board, testifying before the Senate Banking Subcommittee last May 25, pointed out that the rapid transit line built in the median strip of that city's new 10-mile Congress Street expressway cost only about one-third as much as the artery's highway facilities and had three times the latter's carrying capacity, yet the subway is operating at only about one-third capacity and the expressway at near capacity.

Attack by AAA on antiautomobile propaganda

Fear has been raised in some quarters that the renewed interest in rapid transit may block plans for new urban expressways and lead to curbs on use of automobiles. The American Automobile Association has taken the lead in marshaling resistance to what it considers a "widespread propaganda campaign, carried on by a * * * highly vocal * * * minority whose aim is to curtail or prohibit use of passenger cars in downtown areas and to restrict or prevent the building of urban expressways." The antiautomobile, antifreeway people are said to include "some mass public transit interests, some planners, some theorists including sociologists and economists, some dissident groups * * * and some public officers who would rather see the urban highway program wrecked or indefinitely delayed than have one penny come from a source other than the pockets of highway users." [5]

The AAA favors construction of both expressways and mass transit facilities, but it considers the former more urgently needed in most areas. The association asserts that rail transit facilities are called for now in only 6 to 10 of the larger metropolitan areas, though half a dozen additional areas may require them in the next few years.

The association has taken particular exception to a Commerce Department report last March on "Federal Transportation Policy and Program" which urged a new look at urban transportation and stressed the need for more rapid transit. The AAA executive committee declared that the report failed to recognize and urge proper provisions for the dynamic continuing growth of highway transportation. The very nature of metropolitan development, with its increasing dispersion of residences, shopping centers and industry, was said to indicate a growing need for passenger car transportation since urban decentralization continues to reduce the opportunity for economic mass transportation.

Specific objection was raised to a suggestion that communities might attack traffic congestion by placing "charges on city highway gateways to help divert auto commuter travel to mass transport means, higher community parking fees to help similarly [and] diversion of such funds to pay for other transport facilities." AAA President Frederick T. McGuire described this as an iniquitous proposal * * * [to] soak the motorist * * * turning the loot over to subsidize public transportation.

FEDERAL ROLE IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION

The role of the Federal Government in urban transportation planning has been growing and is likely to become larger in the years ahead. The Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, which initiated the Federal-State program of highway construction, sustained prevailing State policy by forbidding use of highway funds within the bounds of incorporated cities.

State aid for highway construction in specific urban areas began to be made available shortly after World War I. The first use of Federal money for improvement of city thoroughfares was authorized by the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 in connection with an emergency, make-work program. Statutory prohibitions on use of Federal road funds within city limits were permanently lifted in 1934.

Extension of aid to local highway building

Ten years later Congress for the first time allocated a part of the highway construction authorizations to urban portions of the Federal-aid primary road system. After that, increasing emphasis was placed on creation of an urban-rural network. The 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act, which accelerated construction of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, expressed "the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce." Nearly one-half of all expenditures on the national road system now go into highways located within or directly serving urban areas.

The highway program has progressed to a point where the officials most closely concerned feel that further development of the urban sections needs in each case to be tied in with overall urban development plans. The transportation plan would adjust freeway construction, street widening, rapid transit development and other projected traffic improvements to the designated patterns of future land use and the volume of traffic expected in future in each section of the metropolitan area.

The Commerce Department's report last April on "Rationale of Federal Transportation Policy" called for a reexamination of the highway program with respect to urban transportation. It urged closer coordination of all aspects of municipal planning so that future highway expenditures would be based on integrated plans for different types of transportation facilities. Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, said in Boston on June 9 that "The interstate system cannot possibly solve all the existing and future highway needs of our urban areas." Overextension of urban freeways, Armstrong warned, would "only destroy the desired operational characteristics of these facilities and in the end compound rather than relieve the transportation problems of our urban areas." He said the critical need was for each area to develop "a comprehensive transportation plan, which * * * must be an integral part of the area's overall plans for urban development and growth."

Need for coordinated transportation planning

A combination of factors has stood in the way of overall planning of urban transportation. The Committee for Economic Development has pointed out:

"Transportation networks within metropolitan areas are basic, the capital costs of new construction are high, and the operating costs of rail and mass transportation are heavy. Yet in most metropolitan areas there is no single public agency able to study the relative needs for highway, mass transit, or rail. There is no single body able to allocate costs among users, businesses and the general tax funds. No authoritative body is able to balance transportation capacity and the traffic-generating uses of land.

Under these circumstances many ills are apparent: undue congestion, duplicated facilities, poor service, financial difficulties, inequitable sharing of burdens, and inadequate anticipation of future needs and costs.[6]

[5] Frederick T. McGuire, Jr., president of American Automobile Association, at AAA meeting in Cleveland, Oct. 11, 1960.

[6] Committee for Economic Development, "Guiding Metropolitan Growth" (August 1960), p. 23.

The summary of a coming Senate Commerce Committee report on "National Transportation Policy" attributes deep-seated deficiencies in urban transportation to lack of coordination between the various systems for moving people. "We have a jumble of bits and pieces—scraps of multilane highway, bridges, tunnels, parking facilities, bus companies, rapid transit lines, and suburban railroad trains—all built without planning and without rational integration and coordination of services." The fundamental problem is that there is no present jurisdiction of government that fits the metropolitan area when areawide planning and construction are required.

The Federal Government has stimulated some degree of urban transportation planning under multijurisdictional authorities, however, by making funds available for the purpose under the housing and highway programs. Commissioner Armstrong has said that efforts of the Bureau of Public Roads to link the highway program with urban development have been successful in a number of communities and that its surveys show "there has been a lot more planning than is generally supposed."[7]

President Eisenhower noted in his last budget message, January 16, that the Department of Commerce along with the Housing and Home Finance Agency had established a new procedure for joint use of urban planning grants and highway research and planning funds to encourage effective coordination and cooperation among the many local governments and the State and Federal agencies engaged in metropolitan development activities. He recommended that statutory limitations on appropriations for urban planning grants be removed, and that Federal grants be increased from $4 million in the current fiscal year to $10 million in fiscal 1962.

The 1960 Democratic platform called for "Federal aid for comprehensive metropolitan transportation programs, including bus and rail mass transit, commuter railroads as well as highway programs and construction of civil airports." Among immediate objectives put forth in a report on regulatory agencies which James L. Landis submitted to President-elect Kennedy on December 26 were the following:

"1. Achievement of a program for amelioration of interurban public transportation, including establishment of metropolitan transit commissions with Federal aid * * * for the acquisition and improvement of facilities and equipment under sound engineering, operating and financing plans.

"2. Formulation of policies to coordinate Federal highway aid programs with approved metropolitan transit plans, so as to promote the economic soundness and efficiency of metropolitan transportation systems as a whole, with emphasis on the avoidance of traffic congestion and the decline of public transportation."

Kennedy's task force on housing and urban development, headed by Joseph P. McMurray, recommended on January 7 immediate enactment of a program for planning grants and $100 million for public facility loans and creation of a Presidential study commission to determine future [urban transportation] needs.

The National Committee on Urban Transportation, founded in 1954, has developed a series of guides and manuals to assist in gathering and analyzing the factual data needed for transportation planning. The manuals, product of the joint efforts of 175 top experts, not only provide guides to methods of determining transportation needs but also explain how to set up the financial, legal, and administrative machinery needed to carry out a plan.

Proposal to assist mass transit development

The Senate approved a bill last year to amend the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize Federal grants for planning of transportation systems in metropolitan areas and Federal loans for improvement of mass transportation systems. The Senate Banking Committee's report on the bill (labeled the Mass Transportation Act of 1960) noted that the Federal highway program was "on the verge of large-scale construction in metropolitan areas" but that "most urban communities * * * lack adequate comprehensive plans." The committee felt that, while there had been considerable highway planning at Federal and State levels, local communities had not been sufficiently engaged in the effort.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, who introduced the bill, said that it would encourage more study of the interrelationship between transportation and urban development and thereby constitute a step toward tackling congestion at its source. Instead of continually increasing transportation capacity to accommodate unplanned growth, efforts would be made to control future land use and thus limit the need for proliferation of highways.

Loans authorized by the measure were to be made, through the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to assist States and local governments in building mass transportation facilities conforming to coordinated transportation-urban development plans. The loans, limited to an aggregate $100 million outstanding, were to bear interest at a maximum rate of 3⅛ percent. Loans were to go only to municipalities which were unable to obtain funds from other sources at equally favorable rates of interest. Proceeds of the loans were to be used to acquire, construct or improve transportation facilities and equipment. They might be used to buy new railroad commuter cars, to relocate railroad stations, to provide fringe parking adjacent to bus or rail stations, to modernize traffic control systems, or for comparable purposes. The Senate passed the bill on June 27, but it failed of action by the House before adjournment.

A similar bill introduced by WILLIAMS on January 11 of this year would offer still broader assistance. Authorizations for low-cost, long-term loans would be raised from $100 million the first year to $150 million thereafter. Provision would be made for a Federal program of technical assistance and research on land use and transportation planning, on costs of traffic congestion, on commutation patterns, and on new technological developments in transport. A grant program of $75 million would be available to help States and localities prepare areawide transportation plans, and undertake actual demonstration projects.

The Eisenhower administration opposed last year's Williams bill. Acting Secretary of the Treasury Laurence B. Robbins expressed the view, in a letter to the Senate Banking Committee on May 9, that "the development of adequate urban transportation systems is the primary responsibility of the municipalities and * * * transit authorities." The financial burden should not be shifted to the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole. Both the Treasury Department and the Housing and Home Finance Agency objected that the subsidy interest rate would put an unreasonable burden on the Federal Government.

Federal interest in urban transportation crisis

Federal interest in solution of urban traffic problems is based on recognition of the economic implications of the urban transportation crisis to the Nation as a whole. The Senate Banking Committee said in its report on the Williams bill last June 15:

"The congestion of vehicles stifles downtown business activity, which, in turn, reduces city revenue from real estate and retail sales taxes. The lack of adequate mass transportation wastes several billions of dollars of productive time lost in traffic jams. * * * The movement of goods in urban areas and in interstate commerce is delayed, thus adding to their cost.

"In short, traffic congestion acts as a brake on the economic growth of the metropolitan areas and thus on the growth of the Nation, inasmuch as the metropolitan areas account for more than 75 percent of all manufacturing and of wholesale and retail sales in the country."

Overloading of city streets is a particular aspect of the problem that engages the attention of the Federal Government. The Banking Committee said the Federal Government was obliged to help in developing steps to assure the most efficient use of urban highways so as to limit the continuing demand for heavy expenditures of highway funds in concentrated urban areas to compensate for the mass transportation decline. The summary of the coming Senate Commerce Committee report on transportation policy asserts that "the Federal Government * * * has a certain responsibility to work cooperatively with local public organizations for preserving and operating rail services." It recommends more low-interest credit and tax relief for rail systems operating commuter services.

Overlapping of political jurisdictions in metropolitan areas tends to bring the Federal Government into the local transportation picture. The Commerce Committee report says that solution of the urban transport problem depends to large extent on finding "the best way to administer public funds and public operation in all parts of large, multi-State areas." It recommends that the Federal Government (1) better coordinate the many Federal programs (for) spending money in metropolitan areas; (2) much more actively support comprehensive, area-wide land use and transportation planning; and (3) undertake an adequate program of basic research in organic urban growth and in urban economic and transportation development. After these programs have been put underway, it will be possible to make a sound judgment as to the need for additional Federal expenditures for urban transportation and how they should be applied.

STEPS TO RELIEVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Steps taken to keep abreast of the rising tide of automobile traffic, beyond building freeways and expressways, have ranged from restoration of faltering rapid transit systems to installation of new traffic control devices. There is some indication that the fall in patronage of public transit has been checked. At a convention of the American Transit Association in Philadelphia last October, upturns in business for the first time in more than a decade were reported from several cities.[8] An AAA survey of urban transportation, scheduled for early publication, has found that "in city after city, where a start has been made on expressway construction and where modern traffic management and engineering techniques have been employed to make better use of old facilities, more

[7] Address at Conference on Economic Problems of Boston Area, June 9, 1960.

[8] The Wall Street Journal reported Oct. 17, 1960, that in the first 8 months of the year the New York Transit Authority had a 2.1 percent gain in patronage and the San Francisco transit system a 0.4 percent increase. Slight gains were recorded in Jacksonville, Fla., and Norfolk, Va.; in certain other cities the rate of decline leveled off.

vehicles are moving at a more rapid pace than they were several years ago, in spite of population growth and increases in motor vehicle registration."

Efforts to salvage rail commuter service

Considerable interest has centered on the efforts of Philadelphia to shore up its declining rail commuter service as an aid to keeping its narrow streets from becoming choked with automobiles.[9] An experimental program for improving commuter service between the downtown and Chestnut Hill sections was set in motion by the city late in 1958 with the cooperation of the two railroads serving the area and the local transit company. The plan provided for improved schedules, a bus-feeder service to rail stations, and reduced fares. The city put up $320,000 to compensate the railroads for expected losses on the service.

Within a year, rail patronage had increased 30 percent, despite the fact that many of the coaches were nearly 50 years old and the dilapidated station facilities had not been renovated. Auto traffic on the most heavily traveled highways in the area dropped 10 percent in the morning hours. Questioning of motorists indicated that 3 out of 10 would switch to the commuter line if the equipment was improved and if parking space convenient to the railroad stations was made available.

Success of this venture led to the launching in September 1959 of a commuter improvement program on a line serving another outlying area. The railroad was compensated for an expected loss of $105,000 during a 33-week experimental period. A study showed that, as a result of these two programs, 2,000 fewer automobiles entered the stream of traffic in the center of the city each day.

Plans now call for an extension of the commuter improvement plan. A nonprofit Passenger Service Improvement Corp., representing the city of Philadelphia, the public, the railroads, and the rail unions, has been formed to negotiate contracts with the railroads to better commuter service. Public funds are being sought for purchase of new equipment to improve the efficiency of commuter line operations.

Beginning last September, the State of New Jersey began paying subsidies to eight railroads under an agreement for maintenance of commuter service to New York City. The legislation authorizing the program, enacted June 6, provided $6 million to finance the State subsidies for 1 year.

New York City, which directly subsidizes mass transit to the tune of $90 million annually, gives commuter lines an indirect subsidy through tax abatement. State legislation enacted 2 years ago created an office of transportation with specific responsibilities for urban and commuter transportation. It authorized State aid to municipalities to cover one-half of the cost of real property tax relief granted by the localities to the railroads. Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller recommended new legislation last January 4 to accelerate provision of local tax relief to railroads with commuter lines in return for definite commitments for continued and improved service. The Governor proposed also a constitutional amendment to enable the State to guarantee New York Port Authority bonds for financing acquisition of commuter-car equipment.[10]

Measures to speed up public transit service

A number of measures have been taken to improve the efficiency of transit operations, not only for the purpose of drawing more patronage to this space-saving form of transportation but also to help keep all traffic moving. Reservation of certain lanes on urban thoroughfares for the exclusive use of buses is proving to be an effective method of alleviating congestion. The special bus lane on one Nashville route is reported to have reduced travel time by as much as 30 percent at certain times of day. In Atlanta bus travel time was cut by one-third and private automobile travel time by a larger figure. Other cities providing special bus lanes include Baltimore, Birmingham, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Dallas.

Opening of service in June 1958 on the rail rapid transit line along Chicago's Congress Street expressway marked a major innovation in combined transit-expressway routing. The expressway, constructed in a ditch that cuts through some of the most heavily built-up sections of the city, has four-lane roadways on either side of the two tracks of the rapid transit line. This facility replaced a 50-year-old elevated line which would have required costly renovation if it had been kept when the new expressway was built.

A number of transit companies have revised routes and eliminated little-used stops to speed up service. The Cleveland transit system experienced an upturn in business after 2,000 parking spaces were provided in lots adjacent to transit stations. Purchase of modern buses has attracted new business in some areas. The St. Louis transit system estimated that acquisition of a large fleet of air-conditioned buses brought a 16.4 percent average daily increase in revenue during the summer of 1958; two-thirds of the new business was retained through the following winter.

Engineering techniques to keep traffic moving

Traffic engineering embraces a host of techniques, devices and regulations used to keep traffic moving when thoroughfares are filled to capacity. One of the cheapest and most effective ways to reduce congestion has been the adoption of a system of one-way streets. According to the AAA, one-way streets have cut travel time in half in many cities.

Painting or otherwise marking traffic lanes on streets and roadways is another relatively inexpensive method of increasing capacity and hence maintaining the flow of traffic. Development of new plastic stripping material has made marking of road lanes a relatively simple and speedy process. Other measures that have been effective in combating traffic congestion include widening narrow streets, installing flexible signal systems, providing special bays for bus stops, and adopting reversible unbalanced traffic lanes to provide more channels for cars going downtown during morning rush hours and for cars going away from the center of the city during afternoon rush periods.

Chicago has been developing what is known as a preferential street system, a network of streets being improved to enable them to carry both local and express traffic with a minimum of delay and congestion. Existing streets and the traffic carried on them were exhaustively studied to provide a realistic basis for designating certain street routes for improvement. The improvements have been varied according to the particular traffic situation or physical limitations. Certain intersections were widened. If the traffic load was heavy enough, grade separations or overpasses were built. In some cases an overpass of only two lanes has provided, at relatively low cost, a free flow of through traffic across an intersection that used to be regularly jammed with cars.

In other instances the city acquired wider than average rights-of-way in areas slated for redevelopment. Access to certain preferential streets was limited to prevent blocking of the traffic flow. At some congested intersections in business districts the preferential route was developed to bypass the commercial area so that other streets could be used freely for local access without being clogged with through traffic. Curb parking bans, one-way street designations, and other traditional devices for controlling traffic have been instituted where deemed advisable.

The preferential street system is a long-range plan to bring about, by increasing the capacity of existing streets, not only freer traffic flow within and between neighborhoods but also improved access to expressways. A governing principle has been to avoid extensive tearing up of streets and to avoid construction of new expressways in the heart of the city. Capacity is increased by carrying out a number of small and relatively inexpensive improvements linked to existing or planned use. Eventually 300 miles of Chicago streets will be developed to maximum standards, with frequent grade separations and separate service drives, while another 800 miles will have minor improvements.

Provision of offstreet parking is a favored device for keeping down congestion. Municipal authorities are reported to have spent around $1 billion on parking facilities. Three-fourths of the cities of 10,000 or more population have provided off-street parking space; only 40 percent of cities in that group had done so a decade ago. The main impetus behind expansion of municipal parking facilities has been the desire to maintain the economic health of the downtown sections of cities.

Use of zoning to facilitate traffic movement

Many local governments are handicapped in making an effective attack on traffic congestion, according to the National Committee on Urban Transportation, by a lack of legal authority to take the necessary action. In some cases municipal authorities are hampered by constitutional or statutory restrictions on their right to raise revenue; in other cases the requirements of obsolete zoning laws get in the way. "Cities must face the fact that the demands of modern urban transportation require modern legal machinery."[11] The committee has prepared a manual to assist local officials and planners in efforts to bring pertinent laws and ordinances up to date.

A U.S. Bureau of Public Roads official urged recently that zoning ordinances be updated "in a manner that will enable them to handle today's [traffic] problems." Appropriate zoning regulations, he said, "can be used to combat the almost universal urban problem of congested traffic facilities." If the zoning regulations recognize "the functional relationship between streets and the zones they serve [they] can help correct defects in existing street systems by achieving a desirable balance between (a) traffic generators of all types and sizes, (b) street capacity for moving vehicles, and (c) off-street parking and other terminal facilities."[12]

---

[9] Mayor Richardson Dilworth told the Senate Banking Subcommittee, May 23, that the average width of Philadelphia streets carrying heavy traffic was only 25 feet from curb to curb.

[10] An official four-State committee, representing Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York and Rhode Island, proposed on January 21 an emergency plan to rescue the financially stricken New Haven Railroad, which serves localities in all four States. The plan calls for a 75 percent cut in local and State taxes on the carrier, repeal of the Federal excise tax on noncommuter fares without a corresponding fare reduction, and increases in commuter fares in return for a commitment to improve passenger service.

[11] National Committee on Urban Transportation, "Better Transport for Your City" (1958), p. 86.

[12] W. H. Stanhagen, "Zoning and Traffic Congestion," Urban Research, 1960, p. 21.

Zoning regulations, it was said, should require new commercial developments to provide separate service roads, buffer strips and building setbacks. An increasing number of communities now are making it mandatory for new office buildings and other commercial establishments to provide offstreet parking and loading facilities to prevent congestion on adjacent streets.

Most of the measures being taken today to relieve congestion represent efforts to correct conditions that have been growing progressively worse with the rapid postwar increase of motor vehicle traffic. A commentator on metropolitan problems has suggested that "the day may come when a profession of specialized expediters may watch over the smooth and quick flow of traffic and communication in our metropolitan areas, to identify and remove bottlenecks and overloads before their effects become cumulative and choking." [13]

BEYOND WILDERNESS TO URBAN OPEN SPACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a series of three fine articles entitled "Our National Parks in Jeopardy," appearing in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly, describes the mounting pressures on our national parks, which threaten to destroy the very qualities for which they were established.

In 1959, more than 22 million visitors were registered in our national parks, and 5 million in the national nature monuments—an increase of 14 million over the highest pre-World War II figure. The Mission 66 program of the National Park Service estimates that by 1966, 80 million people will be visiting our national parks.

The unpleasant truth is that unless vigorous steps are taken, the great national parks and forest preserves that we now treasure will become the park slums of the future.

It is for that reason that I strongly support the wilderness bill to reserve a small portion of our Federal forest, park, and refuge land in its present wilderness state, so it may remain unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

But it is not enough just to save what we have. That will not lessen the mounting pressures that threaten our wilderness areas. What we need is a program of open space acquisition in and around our urban areas—where people actually live—if we are to achieve a long-range solution to the problem of preservation of our wilderness areas.

Recently, I introduced a bill, S. 858, to help preserve urban open space and, in the process, to encourage more economic and desirable patterns of urban development and growth.

I hope the Congress will soon enact the wilderness bill, and will give serious consideration to the needs for open space in and around our Nation's cities and towns.

As background for the consideration of this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

[13] Karl Deutsch, "On Social Communication and the Metropolis," Daedalus, winter, 1961, p. 108.

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

RESORTS OR WILDERNESS?

(By Devereux Butcher)

Summer crowds had gone, and we had Yellowstone National Park almost to ourselves. As we stood watching Old Faithful Geyser, I wondered how many among the more than a million people who saw that beautiful display last summer had ever heard about the attempts of local water users, in 1920, to dam Yellowstone Lake. Had the irrigationists had their way, underground water levels might have been so disturbed as to alter or destroy completely the geysers and other thermal features of the park.

Our national parks today are under ceaseless attack, ranging all the way from the demands of powerful commercial interests to those originating in departments of the Government.

I remember one walk I took along a trail through the rain forest of Olympic National Park, Wash. Cushioned with moss and gay with ferns, the giant trees towered close around, and there was no sound but the drip, drip of water from the foliage. This was the forest primeval, and it seemed the more impressive to realize that it was only a remnant of what once was. Yet, save for the vision of certain public-spirited men and women, these 200-foot Sitka spruces, western hemlocks, redcedars, and Douglas-firs would have been leveled. At the time of my visit, in the late 1940's, the local lumber industry had succeeded in having no fewer than eight bills introduced in Congress to sever this forest from the park and make it available for logging. Public opinion became aroused, however; hearings were held; and in the upshot Congress defended the park and not one of the eight bills was passed.

Similarly, in the early 1950's public opinion thwarted the Bureau of Reclamation's scheme to dam the Green River in Dinosaur National Monument, Utah-Colo., which would have turned the magnificent canyons of the Green and Yampa into a reservoir 500 feet deep and 40 miles long.

Through the years there have been many attempts by commercial interests to utilize national park and monument lands. Today there is a new menace, the more dangerous for being so human: the pressure of numbers is threatening the validity of the act of 1916 creating the National Park Service. This act directs the service to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The directives to "leave them unimpaired" and to "provide for the enjoyment of the same" are rapidly becoming irreconcilable.

No one in 1916 could have foreseen the great numbers of people who would visit the parks three or four decades later, to sleep there and to camp. In 1959, 22,392,000 visitors were recorded in the national parks, and 5,269,000 in the national nature monuments, an increase of 14 million over the highest pre-World War II figure. Stated starkly, the question is whether we can continue to provide more beds and more meals and still keep the parks "unimpaired."

Millions of city dwellers go back to nature at every opportunity. We crave the unfulfilled refreshment and spiritual uplift that only contact with nature can give. Our objective, then, must be to keep the national parks, as nearly as possible, as nature made them, so that they can supply this human need for generations to come. That, clearly, was what Congress meant by the directive to "leave them unimpaired."

MOUNT M'KINLEY

Let's see what is happening in Mount McKinley. My wife and I first visited Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, in June 1958. We drove the 180-mile round trip to Wonder Lake, and it took all day. We passed through verdant valleys and over barren passes, saw the flower-strewn tundra, encountered birds new to us, and had the thrill of watching a pair of the big Toklat grizzly bears, as well as caribou, Dall sheep, and red foxes. But all of these were only part of our experience. What made that trip even more memorable was that we were driving through a scenically magnificent wilderness unblemished by man except for the road that took us there. The park hotel, headquarters, powerhouse, employees' dormitory, railroad station—all were at the park's eastern edge, and as we drove west our pleasure was enhanced by the knowledge that no hotel, nor visitor center, nor even a powerline was out there ahead of us. Nowhere in all that vast rugged landscape was there any impairment of the natural scene.

At the time of our visit, a development program was just being started. The road was scheduled for widening and surfacing to take care of traffic coming in over the newly completed extension of the Denali Highway. This widening, including construction of minor roads and trails, might have been done at a fraction of the estimated $7,178,600, had it been limited to sheering off the sharper curves and extending shoulders in the narrower places. Twenty miles of the road now have been widened to 26 feet, with fills up to 12 or more feet deep. The first visitor center has been built at Mount Eielson, 60 miles out. Except for two or three necessary ranger cabins hidden in the trees, this is the first building to intrude on the park's heartland wilderness.

Another visitor center is planned close to the hotel for the convenience of guests. This one should suffice for the park, but the planners have other ideas. Their prospectus for Mount McKinley calls for an expenditure of $9,700,000. It says that the development of this park is still in its infancy but that facilities and services are being installed for the fullest enjoyment of the area by an increasingly mobile public. This is anything but reassuring. What does the Service consider to be an experience of fullest enjoyment? The prospectus further says that the program should be carried out so as to maintain wilderness integrity. How can such encroachment on the natural scene help to maintain wilderness integrity? Can anything less than the unblemished scene provide a richer experience? Has the point been missed that every manmade intrusion on the scene will reduce the quality of the visitor's experience? No effort should be spared to retain the ideal conditions that still prevail at Mount McKinley, for here, perhaps more than in any other national park, the two directives of the 1916 act have been kept in close harmony.

THE EVERGLADES

When Everglades National Park, Fla., was established in late 1947, under a 1934 authorization act, the area was an unblemished wilderness except for a few patches of agricultural land on the eastern side and a winding dirt road that ended 40 miles away at a little group of weathered fishermen's shacks known as Flamingo overlooking Florida Bay. The park was, in fact, as much an unblemished wilderness and wildlife sanctuary as Mount McKinley at the time of our visit.

Newton B. Drury, who was National Park Service Director in 1947, said that before starting any development in Everglades, the area would be studied to make sure that whatever was done would not disturb the wildlife, which constituted the park's principal, and perhaps most fragile, feature.

A new administration came into office in the early 1950's, and since then the 40-mile

road has been improved and it fills its purpose well; but at its southern end, where the shacks once stood, there is now a fishing-yachting resort of the kind that is a dime a dozen in Florida.

There is a 60-room motel, a dining room seating 200, a marina, 57 boat slips, with dockside electric power and water, accommodating boats up to a hundred feet in length, and a hoist for boats up to 5,000 pounds. A channel dug across part of the park's Florida Bay provides access for yachts. Marine supplies—gas, diesel fuel, bait, tackle, and ice—are for sale. There is a launching ramp for boats brought in on trailers. Sightseeing trips run daily to the Cuthbert rookery, when the birds are nesting, and to Cape Sable, White Water Bay, and Florida Bay; inboard and outboard boats are for rent with or without guides, as are 30- and 40-foot self-propelled houseboats that sleep four to six persons. Fifteen- and sixteen-foot Fiberglas boats also are for rent, with or without motors. The supplies and personnel required for this operation must be trucked 40 miles through the park.

Is this big commercial resort in accord with the authorization act? Congress specifically directed that the area "shall be permanently reserved as a wilderness, and no development * * * for the entertainment of visitors shall be undertaken which will interfere with the preservation intact of the unique flora and fauna and the essential natural primitive conditions now prevailing in this area."

Why, may we ask, were the overnight accommodations not located at the park entrance, where they would not interfere with the habitats and feeding areas of the birds—and where, incidentally, the buildings would have been less exposed to hurricanes? A snack bar, a small visitor center, and a quiet launch or two for naturalist-conducted cruises would have been adequate to meet visitor needs at Flamingo, and bird life and the natural scene would have suffered a minimum of disturbance. In September, Hurricane Donna destroyed Flamingo, but it is being rebuilt on the original site as these words are written.

In this comparatively new national park, the National Park Service had an opportunity to show that it had benefited from past mistakes and to demonstrate how a great nature sanctuary should be cared for. Did it?

Even before construction, the Park Service recognized the hazards to wildlife. It also foresaw obstacles such as the need to build land above water level for roads, a limited supply of fresh water, and a serious problem of sewage disposal. To implement the program, the service asked for $12 million, and here, as at Mount McKinley, the new building was part of an overall plan.

When the National Park Service administration took office under President Eisenhower, roads and accommodations throughout the system were inadequate, with the demand for meals and beds far exceeding the supply. On the evening of February 8, 1955, the American Automobile Association and the Department of the Interior sponsored an American pioneer dinner in Washington, D.C. The occasion marked the launching of Mission 66, a 10-year park rehabilitation program to be carried out by the National Park Service and to be completed by 1966. The purpose was to provide enough accommodations, and facilities inside the parks to take care of an expected 80 million a year by 1966. While the need for action was understandable and the program was widely acclaimed, there were some even within the service who sensed trouble ahead.

YELLOWSTONE

Yellowstone is the scene of one of the most expansive and elaborate of Mission 66 projects. A lodge and cabins were torn down on the south rim of the spectacular canyon of the Yellowstone River. Well rid of the unsightly structures, this beauty spot is being restored to nature; but across the canyon and back in the woodland, a whole new village has been built, complete with lodge, dozens of boxlike cabins for visitors, two 2-story dormitories for employees, a concessioner's office building, store, visitor center, and a large parking area.

As elsewhere, the Park Service built a case to justify this big development. It is said that Yellowstone is so vast and remote that it cannot be experienced in a single day, and visitors need facilities to enable them to remain in the park either overnight or for a week or more. The park prospectus explains that Yellowstone visitors will reach an estimated 2 million by 1966 and that overnight accommodations must be expanded from the 8,500 capacity of 1955 to 15,000 in 1966; and this calls for increased housing, food, medical supplies, and other services of a small city. More visitors' facilities require more employees. Together with utilities, this project has cost $70 million. Concerning the removal of the earlier development, a Park Service release quoted Director Conrad L. Wirth as saying, "The old development is an intrusion on the natural scene which the Service is charged by law to preserve." How could the Director fail to see that the new village is an even greater intrusion on the natural scene?

Two more villages are scheduled for the park: Grant Village, to be even larger than Canyon Village, at the west side of Yellowstone Lake; and Firehole Village, near Old Faithful.

One thing leads to another: Up to now, the Park Service and the concessioner have supplied the park's electricity with 30 diesel-powered generators. Because of the expansion, commercial power, says the Service, has become a necessity; and as this is written, Yellowstone's forests are being cut to make way for power lines, many miles of them—further marring the park's beauty.

Yellowstone was our first national park, established by act of Congress in 1872. It was made accessible during the stagecoach era. Long distances and slow travel required that hotels and camps be located at the end of each day's journey. Today, smooth roads and fast automobiles do away with the necessity to stay in the park overnight; yet the National Park Service still administers it as though we were living in the old days.

GRAND CANYON

On May 6, 1903, according to the Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedia, our 25th President wrote, "In the Grand Canyon, Arizona has a natural wonder which, as far as I know is in kind absolutely unparalleled throughout the rest of the world. I want to ask you to do one thing in connection with it in your interest and in the interest of the country—keep this great wonder of nature as it now is * * *. I hope you will not have a building of any kind, nor a summer cottage, a hotel, or anything else, to mar the wonderful grandeur, the sublimity, the great loneliness and beauty of the canyon."

Today, at Grand Canyon Village, the rim is cluttered with buildings—a hotel, lodge, and cabins, souvenir shops, grocery store, garage, gas station, post office, community hall, railroad and station, mule corral, park headquarters, hospital, and behind these the maintenance shops and concessioner and Government residential areas—and a number of new residences are about to be built. Already Mission 66 has had its effect here. The village has been extended eastward a half mile by construction of a new big motel, restaurant, and campground.

With Park Service approval, the village is planned also to be extended westward, where a Shrine of the Ages, a million-dollar church, is proposed to be built on the rim. Opposition to this has been vigorous and nationwide, both as to site and design. In 1955, a Shrine of the Ages Corp. was formed, made up of members of the clergy of three denominations, park concessioners, and members of the National Park Service. A National Chairman's Steering Committee composed of a number of Arizona businessmen, the clergy, and members of the National Park Service was organized. A National Advisory Board was created, and a nationwide fund-raising drive was launched and has been carried on now for several years, not with entire success.

Dr. Harold C. Bradley, a director of the Sierra Club, one of many groups that opposed the shrine, considered it a highly controversial issue. He questioned whether it would violate the letter of national park law, as well as its spirit, and he warned that we, the citizens, owners, and users of the parks, the ultimate dictators of national park policy, need to decide what the future of these dedicated areas is to be, or we shall find ourselves standing by and watching a small but potent pressure group decide that policy for us. He considered that any edifice on or near the rim of the Grand Canyon would be out of place and a distraction, and that a million dollars to clear away the present clutter of structures would be a worthwhile investment. Such clearing would conform to a stated objective of Mission 66.

The sprawling village on the south rim should indeed be cleared away, and a new one established a half mile or more back, close to the park's southern boundary. Here the railroad would end and the entrance road would fork to east and west to join the rim road at points perhaps 2 miles apart. The road between these points would be removed, and the new village would be at the apex of a triangle formed by the forks of the road and the rim. No roads or buildings would mar that triangular area, but a footpath would cross it from the village through the forest to the rim. I like to think of the impact the canyon would have on visitors who, free of urban sights and sounds in the peace and quiet of the forest, would stroll down that path to the rim for their first glimpse of the canyon.

GRAND TETON

Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., is being given a Mission 66 treatment that is costing an estimated $8,400,000. Plans called for visitor service facilities, expanded campgrounds and picnic areas, improved roads and trails, adequate water, sewage, and other utilities. Much of this has been done.

The largest development in the park is at Colter Bay, on the eastern shore of Jackson Lake. It contains about 150 cabins, a cafeteria, a laundromat with showers for men and women, a store, snackbar, boat and tackle shop, picnic area, campgrounds, boat dock, unloading ramp, and parking area. The largest single item is a de luxe trailer park, complete with all the comforts of home. Various kinds of boating are provided, including speedboating, with its inevitable accompaniment of water skiing. Not far away is the plush, concessioner-operated Jackson Lake Lodge and cabins, accommodating 1,100 guests.

The Park Service considers the Colter Bay development an inspiring example of what can be accomplished under Mission 66 through cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and private enterprise; but where is all this to stop? Are we to go on spreading the Colter Bay development over an ever-wider area of land dedicated to the preservation of natural conditions? Shall we someday double the size of Jackson Lake Lodge?

Under Mission 66, too many of the parks are being cluttered with buildings of freak and austere design. No longer are the architects concerned with producing structures of beauty and charm that help to create a proper atmosphere and are inconspicuous and harmonious with their surroundings. Rather, they seem obsessed with designing

monuments to their own inventiveness. Widely criticized, these buildings are unlike any others in the parks and are creating a hodgepodge where, instead, there should be uniformity.

There are several parks with buildings of fitting design, such as Shenandoah and the Blue Ridge Parkway. Cecil J. Doty, a Park Service architect, formerly showed good taste. He should be proud of his headquarters and concession buildings at Bandelier National Monument, N. Mex., built in the 1930's. Constructed of simple, inexpensive concrete block faced with stucco, these handsome buildings not only create a suitable atmosphere but also harmonize with the prehistoric Indian dwellings that once existed here. Yet Doty, like many other Park Service architects, has abandoned the appropriate for what is termed "contemporary." The public, which pays the bill, has a right to demand a return to harmony in park architecture. A national park is not the place for fads and experiments, it should not be intruded upon by eye-catching architectural monstrosities.

In recent years, a number of nonconforming amusements have been finding their way into the national parks. I recall, in the summer of 1952, rowing across Grand Teton's Jenny Lake to explore and photograph the wild western shore. At no time during that otherwise pleasant occasion were we free of the roar of concessioner-operated speedboats. Even the National Park Service, which has been giving way to pressures for resort-type amusements seems to be showing alarm over the use of powerboats, one of the most destructive enemies of wilderness atmosphere. On August 4, 1959, Yellowstone's superintendent, Lemuel A. Garrison, described the use of powerboats on Yellowstone Lake in these words: "They create a commotion and a racket that destroys any shred of belief that this is the forest primeval or that it is other than a boating racetrack. The occasional visitor who desires to paddle a canoe along shore or to row quietly is run out of the lake entirely, for these motorboats control and dominate the environment." And he concluded, "We have unknowingly built up some loathsome messes of camp debris and garbage around the lake from boating camps."

The Service suggested closing the three southern arms—20 percent of the lake area—to powerboats. This seemed an excellent way to begin to remedy the problem, and it brought the Service nationwide support from those who seek to uphold national park integrity. As would be expected, opposition came from the local boaters, who stirred up such a hue and cry that Senator GALE MCGEE of Wyoming held a public hearing at Cody, on February 3, 1960.

The Service had outlined a development plan to go into effect along with the closing of the southern arms of the lake. Essentially, the suggestions was to build a launching ramp or two and install a number of campgrounds and parking areas to assist boaters. This seemed fair, since powerboats were to be eliminated from only a small part of the lake, at least for the present, and park defenders felt that at last the Service recognized its past mistakes.

Then, on June 29, the full scope of what the Service had been planning came to light. The Service announced that a contract had been let to begin construction of a new development in Yellowstone: a full-scale boating resort, the first phase of which was to cost $354,623 and would involve beautiful little Bridge Bay, south of Lake Hotel and Fishing Bridge.

The development "will be located along a lagoon that runs into the forest from Bridge Bay itself," says the report, and because the lagoon is shallow, a 6- to 8-foot channel will be dredged; but "before this can be done, bulkhead and piling construction must be completed to allow construction of docks and other facilities." The plan calls for a new bridge and approaches across the neck of the bay, a modern marina for 250 boats, a parking area, access roads, a ranger and information station, and later, overnight accommodations, a store selling camp and boat supplies, a second marina for another 250 boats at Grant Village (the latter to be part of the second phase), campgrounds for boaters, wilderness camps in zoned areas, and a lake patrol. We are told the reason for all this is "to relieve the extreme boating congestion at Fishing Bridge." Bridge Bay Marina was begun last summer.

These facilities, while they will temporarily relieve congestion, can only serve to entice more boaters. The development, to be far larger than the Flamingo resort in Everglades National Park, must inevitably cast doubt on the sincerity of the Service in making its show of alarm in 1959. Were the words of Superintendent Garrison and the proposal to close the lake's southern arms only a smokescreen to forestall expected objections by supporters of national park integrity when the full scope of the plan would be made known?

With countless lakes, rivers, and coastal areas open to boating of every kind, we seem unable to hold the wilderness atmosphere on the few waters of our national parks by keeping them closed to all but canoes, rowboats, or quiet launches for naturalist-guided sightseeing cruises.

YOSEMITE

The introduction of winter-use facilities—specifically, mechanical ski lifts—in some national parks constitutes another disruption of wilderness atmosphere and of the natural scene.

Yosemite's Badger Pass ski resort, granddaddy of several national park ski developments, was approved during the previous park administration. Like the others, it is in accord with the Service's revised winter use policy, adopted in 1946 and reaffirmed in 1953. Here are four T-bar lifts and engine buildings, a restaurant, infirmary, ski rental shop, parking area, and several ski runs cut through the forest. The national parks needs no such extraneous diversions or artificial embellishments to make them attractive. They are sufficient in themselves. Preservation of the magnificence that nature has lavished here is the sole reason for their being national parks.

At Yosemite, slalom races are advertised and held every winter in spite of the Park Service's stated policy to keep the parks free of organized competitive sports and spectator events, which attract abnormal concentrations of visitors and require facilities, services, and manpower above those needed for normal operation.

Shall we have resorts or wilderness? In 1953 the Park Service authorized a full-fledged ski area in Rocky Mountain National Park's Hidden Valley in response to a local chamber of commerce request. In 1954 certain commercial interests in the State of Washington brought pressure for Government approval to install a cable tramway to run from Mount Rainier's Paradise Valley, at 5,000 feet elevation, to the 10,000-foot level at Muir Cabin. Rejecting the tramway proposal because of a flood of letters from all over the Nation opposing it, the Service compromised again with local commercial interests by authorizing a tandem rope tow 2,000 to 3,000 feet long; and an advanced slope with several alternate ski runs served by a T-bar lift from 3,000 to 5,000 feet in length, in addition to new buildings, a new access road, and a new parking area.

Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., which for some years had a portable rope tow, now has a permanent ski lift, together with buildings and parking area; while Crater Lake, Olympic, and Sequoia National Parks have portable rope tows, indicating that, unless this trend is stopped, they too in time will have permanent lifts installed, ski runs cut through their forests, and all the other facilities that are considered necessary for the maintenance of such resorts.

It cost approximately $55,000 to keep the road to Paradise Valley in Mount Rainier open, mostly for local use, during the winter of 1958 to 1959, for instance. Even if such use of the national parks were not a violation of the 1916 act, does limited use by local communities justify this Federal expenditure?

All national parks with sufficient snow are open to ski touring and snowshoeing—the winter equivalent of walking the trails in summer; but the installation of mechanical lifts, which attract crowds primarily interested in downhill skiing, is a misuse of the parks and a violation of basic principle.

Yosemite National Park still holds the dubious honor of being the classic example of overdevelopment, and famous Yosemite Valley is the problem spot. Cluttered with buildings, it is a resort amusement center in every sense. According to the park's Mission 66 prospectus, there is no area in the national park system that is confronted with more difficult and complex manmade problems.

Such is the beauty and cool summer climate of the park that on summer holidays population rises to nearly 70,000 visitors, most of them concentrated in the valley. In Yosemite, through the various seasons, one may participate in dancing, pool swimming, golfing, skating on a manmade rink, and skiing at Badger Pass.

Then there is the firefall, which also draws crowds, and which, like other artificial amusements, has nothing to do with the beauty and wonders of the park and has no rightful place there. Who would dare to say these attractions are not partly responsible for the overcrowding?

The more such pastimes are allowed in the parks, the more difficult it will be to get rid of them, for they are misleading people to regard national parks as resort amusement centers. Speedboats, ski lifts, swimming pools, golf courses, and the like serve only to swell the concessioner's bank account. They have the undesirable effect of drawing people not primarily interested in the parks and encouraging them to stay longer. One does not have to come to a national park to enjoy these facilities. They are abundantly available elsewhere and are as out of place in a national park as a roller-skating rink in the National Gallery of Art would be.

If the Service continues to violate its trust as the people's guardian of the national parks, ceases to recognize preservation of the natural scene, wildlife and wilderness atmosphere as its foremost duty and responsibility, the upbuilding of the system, as originally conceived through nearly a century, will be lost in all but name.

Roadbuilding under Mission 66 has given rise to greater alarm than perhaps any other phase of the program. Disregard of the natural landscape in the construction of the new Tioga Road in Yosemite, for example, has been especially serious. Describing it, a nationally known photographer, Ansel Adams, said: "The old road in a sense 'tiptoed' across the terrain; the new one elbows and shoulders its way through the park—it blasts and gouges the landscape."

True, the 21-mile narrow stretch of the old Tioga mining road needed to be made safe, and Mission 66 gave it priority. Totaling $1,145,175, the contracts for it involved clearing, grubbing, excavating and filling, said a release for July 10, 1957, but no mention was made of the blasting to be done along the shore of beautiful Tenaya Lake and on slopes covered with the polish of ancient glaciers.

There was such a flagrant disregard of natural beauty here, not only in the selection

of route but in the right-of-way width, that Sierra Club, and later National Parks Association, officials visited the project with Department of the Interior personnel in an effort to avert further excessive damage. The controversy went on for months, but the net gain amounted to no more than the tightening of two curves that would force speeders to slow to the park speed limit of 45 miles an hour, a fill across a high granite bowl planned to be 27 feet deep reduced to 12 feet, the grade steepened, and the line moved 40 feet farther down the slope. According to the Sierra Club, the view west from Tenaya Basin and north from Clouds Rest has been scarred permanently, and the most spectacular and most exquisite exhibit of glacier polish along the Tioga Road is destroyed for all time.

The first 8 miles of Grand Canyon's south rim road to be reconstructed under Mission 66, in 1956 and 1957, bypassed half a dozen curves of the old road and went almost straight across the country. No attempt was made to follow land contours or to make the road inconspicuous. Credit goes to Director Wirth, who, when he saw the new construction, issued an order in early 1957 that from now on the old alinement must be followed and the new width reduced. Well may we ask what had happened to the Service's roadbuilding policy.

This sampling of Mission 66 in action shows the trend that is occurring throughout the whole national park and monument system and emphasizes the extent to which the taxpayer unknowingly is taking part in the impairment of those masterpieces of nature's handiwork. To popularize and commercialize the national parks is to cheapen them and to reduce them to the level of ordinary playgrounds. To cherish them for their primeval splendor and give them the kind of protection the pending wilderness bill would afford is to realize the enduring value they have for us and those who will follow us.

The enormous increase of park visitors in the future must give us concern. There is only one answer: To adopt now a policy, to be enforced by legislation, to build no more facilities in the heartlands of the parks, and as additional facilities are needed and existing ones become obsolete, to build new ones at the park entrances, either just inside by concessioners or, better, just outside by local private enterprise. In many more instances than at present, local communities could supply the necessities of park visitors and would increase community income by doing so. Local communities which are already doing this and doing it well are Port Angeles, near Olympic, Estes Park, near Rocky Mountain, and Gatlinburg, near Great Smoky Mountains. Several national parks, notably Acadia, Olympic, Kings Canyon, Wind Cave, Great Smoky Mountains, and as yet Mount McKinley, either have no overnight accommodations in them at all or else on their perimeters only; yet these parks are adequately accessible for public enjoyment.

There are those who contend that only 5 percent of the land in the national parks is developed and that this is so little that it can do no harm, but this argument ignores the very purpose of the areas. The quality of wilderness is fragile. Manmade blemishes anywhere reduce the value of the whole.

Nature Out of Balance

(By Clark C. Van Fleet)

The devastating popularity of our national parks has brought the management of these areas face to face with the problem of how to let every eager visitor in and still keep the wilderness intact. But the question of admission is only one of the problems that must be solved.

The giant redwood tree (Sequoia gigantea) is the largest member of the vegetable kingdom extant. One of its major distinctions is that it has a very shallow root system. Under natural conditions these roots spread out almost on the surface in every direction from the tree, and the feeder roots, fine slender tentacles, reach right up into the humus to feed and suck up water. These rootlets are very tender and are easily damaged. Sequoia National Park was established to preserve and maintain groves of these trees, which are found nowhere in the world except along the west side of the Sierra Range in California. Every year thousands come from all over the world to admire the giant redwoods, wander around amongst them, and marvel at their size and beauty.

A few years ago the park naturalists noticed that some of the trees were showing signs of sickness and that fewer and fewer young trees were in evidence. A careful study revealed that the earth and humus were being heavily impacted around the trees and in the groves by the hordes of people that visited the park, with resulting injury to the rootlets. Furthermore, the tender seeds dropping on impacted soil were unable to take root and died a-borning.

The upland meadows in the high country offer solace and peace after many miles of weary traveling. They are the mecca of every pack wandering in the fastnesses of the mountains. They make travel possible and practical just below the tree line. Even so, these meadows must be gently dealt with if they are to survive. Most of them consist of a bare skin of soil and humus over a rocky or unkindly base. Although the sweet grasses that constitute their cover flourish and survive in abundance under normal conditions, it takes very little overuse, either grazing or hoof pounding, to cause radical changes in their soil stability or their survival.

In the last few years, with the marked increase in travel through the high country in all the western national parks, many of these meadows have suffered serious erosion and damage from overgrazing. In Olympic, Yosemite, Sequoia, and Kings Canyon National Parks, many of the trails into the upper zones should be temporarily closed to entry, and travel on others should be sharply curtailed. Yet, admittedly, the parks are for the people, for their recreation and pleasure.

Mount McKinley National Park, nearly 2 million acres in extent, contains the highest mountain on the North American Continent, large glaciers of the Alaska Range, and a concourse of north country wildlife scarcely to be found anywhere else from Newfoundland to the Aleutians. Wolves are the commonest predators here. Within the bounds of the park these animals wreaked the most havoc amongst the ungulates—mountain sheep, moose, and most spectacularly, the caribou herds. Congress passed a law making it mandatory to destroy the wolves in the park. Although this law has not as yet been fully complied with, we today find the caribou herds so numerous that they are seriously reducing the available forage, and we are threatened with large losses from starvation.

In Yosemite, the deer have been unmolested for years. As a consequence, the oak-grass park lands in the floor of the valley are producing no young oaks at all to replace those older ones that suffer the usual vicissitudes of age. The deer have simply eaten these young saplings as soon as they appeared. Bears have become so numerous as to be an absolute nuisance in many spots within the park.

Yellowstone is faced with much the same trouble regarding bears as Yosemite. It is true that their antics are both intriguing and comical to the transient visitor, but the bears can be extremely destructive, and occasionally quite dangerous to persons not familiar with their quirks.

There are many more problems that beset the administrators of our National Park System. Poaching within the confines of the parks is increasing. Engineers interested in water storage programs are constantly striving to inundate large areas within the parks. Mining promoters press to obtain franchises inside the limits. Grazing and use permits for other activities are consistently sought. Skirmishes for these and other encroachments are yearly occurrences. Most of them are defeated, but just enough sneak by to cause trouble. Artillery ranges, testing grounds, grazing permits, access roads, utility lines—all bring about a never-ceasing attrition of the true purpose of the park.

In the 11 Western States of the National Park System, and particularly in the Far West, the threat of fire is the most fearful enemy. The attack is much more likely to come from without than within. One of the first cautions with which guests of the Park Service are indoctrinated by the rangers and party leaders and guides upon their arrival in the park is a detailed series of "don'ts" about campfires, smoking, and disposal of other lighted material during their visit.

The parks are surrounded by vast holdings of land, both public and private, to which access is frequently granted to hunting parties, campers, fishermen, pack expeditions, and the like. Furthermore, with the extension of roads and highways, with logging penetrating further and further into remote areas, chances of man-started fires are markedly greater. These, coupled with occasional lightning storms that strike in the tinder-dry, brush-covered mountain areas, make the long summer drought a period of watchful anxiety. And the hazard is increasing year by year.

Within my lifetime, California's population has grown from 3 million to 15 million, and this vast inflow of people, with their natural demands for wood and water, has affected the balance of nature. Actually, the western third of the United States is a vast desert, with a thin fringe of greenery encompassing its northern sector and with a narrow strip of green along the Pacific Ocean as far south as Monterey in California. The balance is an area of semidesert, with 30 inches or less annual rainfall, or true desert, with 10 inches or less of rain.

In its pristine state, the northern sector and the narrow coast strip were covered by some of the finest forests to be found in the world: fir, spruce, hemlock, and white pine in the moister areas; ponderosa pine and associated evergreens in the drier sections. These have been logged on at an accelerated rate as the population has grown. This conversion of timber into logs and lumber has gradually denuded the slopes, benches, and ridges of their natural cover. They have been exposed to the pitiless rays of the sun throughout the dry season; they have been beaten into gullies and washes and have been denuded of the topsoil during the floods of winter. Brush and chaparral, jack pine and deciduous trees have filled in the slopes that once supported great stands of conifers. Uncooled masses of moisture-laden air which formerly precipitated as rain now pass beyond those naked hills and ridges. Droughts are of longer duration. Hence the danger from wildfire.

Last year, up to July 31, the National Forest Service fought 1,077 fires on forest lands within its jurisdiction alone that finally burned over 91,000 acres. In the process, three lives were lost, all those of trained firefighters. The Magic Mountain, Johnstone, and Polecat fires in the Angeles Forest alone burned 68,000 acres, and there were smaller blazes in the Los Padres and San Bernardino National Forests. All these occurred before the fire season really started.

For the management and protection of the areas under its control, the National Park

Service expended a fraction more than 70 cents an acre during 1959. The smallest of these plots is the house where Abraham Lincoln died in Washington, D.C., comprising 0.05 of an acre. The largest is Yellowstone Park, with a total of 2,221,772 acres, one of the world's greatest wildlife sanctuaries. Seventy cents an acre seems a niggardly price to pay for governing and protecting an irreplaceable heritage of nearly 23 million acres.

THE PRESSURE OF NUMBERS

(By Paul Brooks)

An occasional camping trip such as my wife and I have made to our national parks and forests is no basis for grand generalizations, yet there is one impression I carry back from every trip, from the Appalachian Trail on the crest of the Great Smokies, from the Border Lakes canoe country, from the alpine meadows of the Olympics, or the hot sands of the Virgin Islands: it is simple wonder—and gratitude—that such places still exist, that such experience is still possible. This has not come about by chance. The very concept of a national park was revolutionary a hundred years ago. In Europe, parks were originally royal preserves, for the sport of a tiny minority. The idea of parks for all the people was of American origin. It is profoundly democratic. And it has worked so well that it now threatens to work its own destruction.

Taken all together, the national parks cover less than 2 percent of the continental United States, and the annual number of visitors amounts to about one-ninth of our population, a number that will certainly increase. Theoretically, this is fine. Actually, it can be catastrophic. Those of us who avoid the most populated spots during the peakloads never see the worst of it, but the fact of overcrowding is everywhere evident. So, alas, is the prescription that may kill the patient—overdevelopment.

Fortunately, the millions who visit the parks do not have identical objectives. There are some people whose spiritual metabolism requires an occasional dose of what Thoreau called the tonic of wildness. They are generally willing to work for what they get. Others go for fishing, for climbing, for photography, for nature study. Still others use the parks to give the whole family a week's inexpensive holiday in beautiful, healthy surroundings; they are probably happiest in a campground with close but congenial neighbors (I find that most people at a park campground are congenial), where there are other children for theirs to play with. All these concerns are equally legitimate. Unhappily, there is also a very different type of visitor—the type that comes looking for readymade entertainment. He stops his car among the redwoods, rolls the window down for a closer look, and complains, "Yeah, I see 'em, but what do you do here?" as if he expected the forest to put on a floorshow. He will never find what he wants in the parks while they remain parks.

The need to accommodate the crowds has inevitably led to compromise in preservation of the natural landscape. Let's face it, this hurts. Since the Great Smokies Park is easily accessible to those of us who live in the East, my wife and I have camped there oftener than anywhere else. Twenty years ago Cades Cove was one of our favorite spots. You reached it by a narrow, twisting road over the mountain; the campground was a level spot beside the river with three or four picnic tables and a privy. Today a wide, graded road comes down the valley, and there is a city of tents with all modern conveniences and firewood for sale. Something has been lost, but an awful lot of people are being made—or, rather, are making themselves—happy. I like to think that their children are learning to love the outdoors and unconsciously preparing themselves to defend it.

Some development is necessary; the danger today is that, under pressure, it may be going hog wild. I venture to suggest that much of this activity—particularly the building of roads for fast cars and marinas for fast boats—is based on a mistaken premise. It is assumed that the public (as distinguished from the automobile and motorboat industries) demands these things and that the parks cannot be used without them. Is this true?

Let us go back a moment to the initial problem: the space available in the national parks is not big enough for all who want to use it. But the size of a park is directly related to the manner in which you use it. If you are in a canoe traveling at 3 miles an hour, the lake on which you are paddling is 10 times as long and 10 times as broad as it is to the man in a speedboat going 30. An hour's paddle will take you as far away as an hour in a speedboat—if there are no speedboats. In other words, more people can use the same space with the same results. Whenever we return from a canoe trip, someone is sure to ask us how many miles we traveled. We never know, and we couldn't care less. I do know, however, that every road that replaces a footpath, every outboard motor that replaces a canoe paddle, shrinks the area of the park. And don't let anyone tell you that this attitude means discrimination in favor of the young and athletic. The man who is too feeble to paddle a canoe should never go tearing off in an outboard motorboat; after all, he may have to paddle home.

Highways, of course, can shrink parks faster than anything else; from my limited experience, I think that they represent the greatest danger to the park system. Walking for 3 consecutive days along the high ridge of the Great Smokies, through dark forests of virgin red spruce and sunny "balds" flaming with azalea, I have shuddered to recall that a scenic highway was once planned for the whole length of this trail (in addition to the adequate highway across Newfound Gap and up to Clingmans Dome). Camping on the ocean strip of Olympic Park, westernmost tip of the United States and the last remaining bit of roadless coastline, I was acutely aware that only the heroic efforts of men like Olaus J. Murie, William O. Douglas, and other devoted conservationists have kept this wild beach from degenerating into another speedway. Our last two trips were in the two national parks that are islands, Isle Royale and the Virgin Islands National Park. Both are blessed with the absence of automobiles. On Isle Royale there is only a foot trail, and in the Virgin Islands a rocky jeep road runs along the spine. Both islands would be spoiled if a highway were ever to be built.

Obviously, some roads are essential to the enjoyment of the parks. The test is, will a road destroy the very thing—the basic value—it is supposed to give access to? In wartime parlance, "Is this trip necessary" at 50 miles an hour? One thinks of the Chinese philosopher who will spend an entire day on a hillside, listening to the ripple of a brook, contemplating the shifting light on a distant mountain peak, and studying the profile of the windblown pine above his head. He has not covered much distance, but he may have traveled far.

Since our parks are not used principally by Chinese philosophers, there is bound to be a demand for improvements, as evidenced by the much-disputed Mission 66. This project, however legitimate its objectives, is sometimes being carried to excess. One can only hope for restraint, in both central planning and local execution. To paraphrase the poet, unless we use the snaffle and the curb all right, there won't be any bloody horse. This is not a military operation; we do not have to build the Burma Road before frost, or even get our trenches dug before dawn. We are not at war with the wilderness.

In our travels, my wife and I have come to recognize among the park personnel—perhaps especially among the men in the naturalist branch—a sense of mission of a very different sort. It is not advertised on the billboards; since it involves brains rather than bulldozers, the results are not so evident on the landscape. In my book, however, it is mission No. 1. The objective will not be achieved by 1966, or any other date, because it is a continuing process—the education of the public to the true uses of its parks. By contagious enthusiasm, rather than by preaching, the men in the field are making the visitor aware of the values (including the spiritual values) he should expect to find in a park. These men have what can only be called a dedication to their job; in fact, nothing less could attract and hold the class of person that one finds everywhere in the Service. Join a nature walk in the Olympic rain forest or among the alpine flowers; likely as not it will be led by a young ranger-naturalist who is raising a family on a tiny budget while he works for a Ph. D. in botany, not in anticipation of an academic career, but to serve in the parks. Talk to the older men; you will find experienced scientists whom any university would be proud to hire, men who have made original contributions in every branch of natural history, ecologists following in the footsteps of Aldo Leopold, botanists whom Bartram and Michaux would have enjoyed as fellow explorers. Show the slightest interest in what they are doing and they will respond far beyond the call of duty. They know that the ultimate answer to the problem of the parks is not so much in physical development as in education. The coming generation will decide the fate of the parks; hence, the need to extend these services beyond the parks themselves into the schools—a mission for broadening minds, not roads.

If there is a keystone in the whole complex structure, it is, I believe, the concept of the wilderness area, the object of which is to preserve for present and future generations some part of our country in its original state, unaltered by man. The scientific and cultural value of such areas is immeasurable; they are to our national park and forest system what libraries, laboratories, and museums are to a great university. Here there can be no compromise. You cannot selectively cut a rain forest and still have a rain forest; you cannot bring a gasoline engine, on wheels or afloat, into a wilderness and still have a wilderness. Today the wilderness bill, which would protect such areas for the future, is still awaiting action by Congress.

The passage of the wilderness bill is one clear-cut and immediate objective, but this alone will not solve the problems of crowding and consequent deterioration with which the Park Service is heroically wrestling. In an era of exploding population, if we are to preserve the parks without enforcing quotas on visitors, the park system itself must be enlarged, to provide more space for more people, to save the finest natural features of our landscape from commercial development, to protect areas of historic significance. For example, the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, under discussion in Congress but not yet voted, would accomplish, to a limited extent, all three objectives. Though its area is not great, it is a still unspoiled bit of the Atlantic seashore rich in history, in folklore, in bird life, in spectacular natural beauty.

In addition to new parks such as this, we desperately need more room, outside the existing park system, to relieve the pressure on that small area of our national heritage

which we are morally obligated to preserve in its primeval state. Cannot Congress establish a system of supplementary park areas under some different designation (preferably adjacent to the national parks themselves) which will be specifically intended for camping and outdoor recreation, in which ski tows and motorboats and other amusements will be permitted, and in which there will be adequate accommodations for large numbers of people amid attractive surroundings? The land already exists within our national forests, and surely the problems of its administration, whether by the Park Service or Forest Service, are not insuperable.

But I am straying into the realm of high-level administration, where these matters are no doubt being urgently discussed. One thing I do know from personal experience: there are innumerable opportunities for outdoor adventure, from an hour's walk in a town forest to a week's backpacking trip on a mountain trail, which do not involve the use of the national parks at all. One way to relieve crowding in the parks is to develop these local alternatives. Take our waterways, for example. Many rivers throughout the country provide quick escape from the mechanized world, but infinitely more would do so if they were redeemed from their present uses as dumps and open sewers. We hear much today about urban renewal. A program of rural renewal and an accelerated program of open-space acquisition near our centers of population would provide closer to home many of the values that people now feel can be found only in the national parks.

The parks themselves have been aptly called living museums. Like a work of art, the natural scene is something that can be used without being used up. How we use it in America will have a very real bearing on the sort of people we become.

When I think of the parks, I recall a scene one July evening on Hurricane Ridge, which overlooks the whole vast range of the Olympics. For several nights we had had the campground to ourselves: a meadow at snowline, on the edge of the glacier lilies. We were slightly disappointed when a large family group settled in opposite us; the peace would be destroyed, the spell would be broken. We were wrong. They had come to enjoy the wilderness, not to dispel it. Their quiet voices didn't reach across the grassy space between us. The black-tailed deer that grazed every morning and evening within steps of our tent were not disturbed. While we were cooking supper we looked up to see the whole group standing quite motionless, like a tableau in the setting sun, around the ribbon of blue smoke from their campfire. They were saying grace.

MASS TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been gratified to note the growing awareness of the problem of traffic congestion and the need to preserve essential mass transportation service in our urban areas. It has become increasingly clear that many transit systems, particularly suburban rail carriers, are in serious financial difficulty. We badly need short-range emergency action to preserve existing service, which would cost exhorbitant amounts to replace; and it is easy to understand the primary attention that has been given to this immediate problem.

At the same time, we need to start devising a sound, long-range program for the improvement of mass transportation, as a means of meeting our total urban transportation needs, which nearly everyone recognizes cannot be met entirely by highways alone, without inflicting heavy financial and social tolls on the vitality of our cities.

One of the important elements of any long-range program must be in the realm of technology. Our cities are now operating with rattletrap commuter vehicles as much as 50 years old, while we launch satellites that can soar around the earth, and places beyond, in a matter of minutes.

We have scarcely scratched the surface in solid research on the technological developments that might enable us to move around a little more comfortably, quickly, and economically in our cities and towns. From time to time we hear stories and we see designs of new monorail systems, aircraft-type ground vehicles, conveyor belt systems, and so forth; but soon they pass from our minds. What we need is not only an intensification of technological research, but also a mechanism for evaluating and disseminating information on the most promising and feasible technological developments that could be put to use to improve urban circulation.

S. 345, which I recently introduced, in cooperation with a number of my Senate colleagues, would authorize broad-scale research on mass transportation problems, specifically including technological developments, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, who also would be authorized to make loans for improvement of mass transportation service, and matching grants for planning and actual demonstration projects, which might include the testing of a promising technological development.

A good summary of some of the broad avenues for technological research is contained in an article entitled "What Is The Future of Metropolitan Transportation," which appeared in the January issue of Public Works magazine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article written by E. H. Harlow, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection?

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

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION?

(By E. H. Harlow)

The present chaotic situation of transportation in our metropolitan areas began with the use of devices invented by man and the abandonment of the creations of nature. For moving people about, these devices are essentially: Railroads; private automobiles; buses; transit vehicles; and airplanes.

Originally, each of these devices was designed to move people. Much of our present day planning has degenerated into schemes for moving vehicles. The distinction is a vital one. For basic purposes, the function of each system has grown more or less as follows:

The railroads, built upon lands granted by State or Federal governments under franchise, were privately financed and operated. Their income, derived from the fares and charges for hauling passengers and freight, has been supplemented by other-purpose leases of the lands held; but has been subject to taxes by the municipalities and States. Railroad capital must show a return of profit to the owners and shareholders if the system is to survive; circumscribed by Federal regulation as public utilities and limited by complex union contracts, the railroads today find the process of change a cumbersome business with staggering obstacles.

The private automobile, successor to the horse and carriage, starting as the rich man's toy and developing into the universal magic carpet, is fully dependent on the public highway system, built with money from gasoline and general taxes in the public interest.

The bus, corollary to the automobile, is also dependent on the public highway system. Bus line franchises to private companies or to municipal agencies are generally expected to show a profit from fares, but contribute toward right-of-way only to the extent of licensing fees and gas taxes.

The transit vehicle, sometimes privately owned but more commonly publicly owned and operated, is a captive of the system of rails, subways, elevated structures or public streets provided generally at public expense along specific routes that cannot readily be changed.

The airplane, which is shrinking time and space at a rate unmatched by any previous conveyance, must still be served by ground terminals using other forms of transportation.

Each of these systems has grown independently, according to our free enterprise motives for profitmaking, but with government sponsorship widely varying in extent and with the fetters of regulation and control vastly different.

THE CHANGING TRAVEL PATTERN

The growth of the city was given direction first by the railroads in an age when the largest number of passenger-miles were carried on shoe leather. Development occurred along the radiating railroad lines, which brought not only fast travel but the transport of freight, as well. This auxiliary use soon overtook in importance the carrying of passengers, which became less profitable as competition from other forms of travel increased.

With industrialization, suburbs grew larger, industry diffused in the middle-core areas, and in most cities a public transit system was needed to carry the increasing volumes of daily commuters and shoppers. Most of the travel was still essentially radial.

The public highway system, following the most traveled routes between and through towns, grew both radially and tangentially, with an intersecting pattern of spreading and merging suburbs. The availability of this expanding highway network started the breakdown of the relatively systematic radial pattern of expansion and travel first set by the railroads.

Now we have the emergence of the present-day situation, with a new heterogeneous pattern stimulated by the personal vehicle on the public road superimposed on the skeletal remains of the older radial geometry. So we find nearly as many people heading out of the city in the morning as into it, and even larger numbers moving in diverse directions from suburb to suburb, even completely across the heart of the city. With the mobility of the private car, there is also an increasing trend toward off-peak hour travel. Nevertheless, the grand rush morning and evening, continues to exceed by 3 to 10 times the travel at other hours.

THE PLACE OF RAPID TRANSIT

Can the mass-carrier system be revived to mitigate the transportations crisis? Obviously, it has limitations: (1) It cannot carry people from everywhere to everywhere, as does the automobile; (2) it must pick up and unload passengers at certain specific

places; (3) it must operate on a schedule; and (4) for economy, it must serve a fairly large number of people.

The first limitation means that mass transit cannot substitute for the automobile everywhere—only possibly on certain routes. The second requires the selection of convenient stations to serve the most people, and the stations must provide means for transfer to other conveyances. The third means that the timing of the vehicle trips and vehicle capacity must be tailored to match the travel desires of the people served.

Now take a look at the travel habits of the people in any metropolis. It is apparent that there are certain travel lines carrying far heavier loads than others. These are the routes, then, that transit may serve. The advantage offered by a modern transit system is its ability to carry widely varying loads over a relatively small strip of land and at higher speeds over short distances than any other mode of travel. For economy of operation, the average distance between stations is considerably less than for the airplane or railroad but more than for the bus.

With such a system come a number of benefits. First is the relief of the staggering peak-hour traffic burden on the highways, which can never handle the situation alone. Second is the channelized travel pattern for an orderly development of the metropolis, a function similar to that of the veins and arteries in a living creature. For a city is in truth a living thing, and its growth process should be an orderly one. The transportation system provides the principal channels for its nourishment. These channels then allow systematic growth without the chaotic cross currents fostered by undirected flow of vehicles. Transportation is a regenerative business; it has a feed-back characteristic in that the kind and location of the transport arteries will, in themselves, influence the nature and growth of the area they are designed to serve.

The kind of transit system that will best meet a city's needs will vary with the particular metropolitan area, its inheritance of present transit facilities, its highways and railroads, its suburban population distribution and trends, and with its topography. A city with a well-developed rail network may find it economic to exploit such an asset to the fullest and to channel as many persons through these existing rights-of-way as possible. One with many wide boulevards and expressways might save millions by using the center islands or shoulder slopes for a new and radically advanced system based on the guided support principle.

The influence of topography on suburban and industrial development of a community is very marked; generally the same influences will control the location and nature of the ideal transit system. For example, contrast New York or San Francisco and their islands and peninsulas, hemmed in by bodies of water, cliffs and hills, with the kind of development on the flat expanses of cities like Chicago.

Therefore, it is not enough to idealize the perfect metropolitan creature and say that a monorail system, for instance, is the universal answer. One must start with a metropolis distorted by geography, history and chance, study its living components and how they can grow best and then fit a suitable transport system into the teeming expanse in a way that will serve it well.

NEWER DEVICES FOR MASS TRANSIT

The kinds of vehicles that can be fitted into such a pattern are many, some old and some still untried: (1) The bus, on public thoroughfares; (2) the bus, on separate right-of-way; (3) the high-speed trolley; (4) the diesel-electric rail car; (5) the rail-bus, a hybrid of (1) and (4); (6) the electric car with third rail or overhead power; (7) the air-supported vehicle, carried on an air film over a rail system; (8) the monorail with suspended car; (9) the monorail with supported car; and (10) the ducted fan vehicle, or air car.

The best type of vehicle for a given need is a matter of individual opinion, as well as of engineering. No one variety will suit all needs. However, wherever a completely new system is practical and economical for mass transit at high speed, attention is being drawn to the seventh item in the above list, which has been suggested to the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District and its advisors. This system would consist of light, aircraft-weight vehicles sliding on upper and lower guide rails. The weight would be carried on the lower box-like rail, under the center of gravity, with a light guide rail for lateral stability directly above the cars. The cars would be without wheels, sliding on thin films of air maintained under pressure between a series of shoes, or skis, and the steel rail surfaces.

Propulsion would be by air jet or, better and quieter, by a magnetic field in the lower, supporting rail, moving ahead in a manner to propel the sliding shoes. The principle is the same as that which operates a solenoid. This latter propulsion system would be fully automatic, eliminating all noise and exhaust fumes, and would make possible a controlled acceleration and deceleration of the cars unaffected by the temperament or skill of the operator who would sit at over-ride controls in the front of the car or train only for emergency operation.

This feature of controlled speed is of surpassing importance, since it would permit fast schedules beyond present consideration. Passenger comfort is affected by acceleration, which governs the force acting upon one's body. More important still, it is affected by the rate of change in this force, or the rate of change of acceleration (the third derivative of the distance verses time relation), which governs the rate at which a standing rider must keep shifting his weight as a car starts forward or slows down to a stop. By regulating this rate, it will be possible to achieve, with comfort, accelerations and velocities that on today's surface vehicles are quite impractical.

Even the few inevitable standing passengers would soon adjust to the high accelerations because the rate would be smooth and consistent for every start and stop. On turns, the lateral inclination of the cars would always be perfectly adjusted to the speed and degree of curvature by the refined and superior control made possible by the upper guide rail system. It has been proven and demonstrated that such a system of guidance at points diametrically opposite the center of gravity will provide a smoother ride than any other, with less secondary motion caused by any slight irregularity of the guides.

The passenger spaces would consist of European-type compartments, with both forward- and rear-facing seats and sliding doors on both sides of the cars to each compartment. A narrow aisle would separate the rows of compartments on each side and provide access between them. The schedules and capacities of cars and trains would be predicated on nearly all passengers being seated in comfort, as they deserve to be.

To aid rapid loading and unloading at stations, cars would always stop at marked spots along the double platforms so that passengers could anticipate the locations of the many doors when the cars stop. Small lights above each door would indicate those compartments that have unoccupied seats and similar lights would be provided along the interior aisles.

NEWER DEVICES FOR PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION

Another development is the small car. By this term is meant the ultimate in single- or possibly two-passenger vehicles in the trend we are now witnessing. The forces causing this steady increase in the sale of small or compact cars are inexorable. As vehicle crowding on the thoroughfares of the Nation increases, the result is necessarily the use of smaller vehicles that will allow a better density of human occupancy of the vast expanses of pavement spreading over the land.

It is startling to think that the present density of people on a busy expressway at rush hour is no better than one person for every 2,000 square feet of right-of-way. Another way of putting it would be to say that if the expressway cost $5 million per mile (in some urban areas it may cost five times that), then each person sits in solid comfort on his private, wheeled divan on a piece of public property worth about $14,000. No wonder that the laws of economics as well as the desire for better transportation are bound to bring about a better use of public space and money. We see this happening in America every day in the form of more tiny cars, motor scooters, and other small vehicles.

However, it may be that what we see now are merely awkward adaptations of older types of vehicles, in the same sense that early locomotives looked like stationary steam engines on wheels. Thus, today, the bicycle is changing into the scooter and the big six-passenger, cross-country car has a small brother. But for urban use what would the ideal vehicle be?

It might be an air-floated platform, 4 feet wide and 6 feet long, having a seat big enough for two at most, with a small compartment in front of the foot-space for purchases at the local shopping center. The upper half would, of course, be enclosed with a transparent removable hood, providing air-conditioned protection from the weather. It might even be wheel-less, propelled by a large ducted fan beneath the passengers; the shaft and motor controlled by a swiveled steering post that would allow the riders to balance above the fan with no more difficulty than a cyclist has in balancing on two wheels.

Such a vehicle would treble the capacity of a present-day expressway. A four-lane expressway today, with every car going 50 miles per hour and spaced five car-lengths apart, would handle about 14,000 people per hour. The same expressway, with three lanes of these small vehicles instead of two in each direction, and with each car going only 30 miles per hour and three car-lengths apart, would handle about 46,000 people per hour.

The small vehicle would also permit more economic designs to further increase the use of public right-of-way. For example, our Federal Interstate standards for expressway design require wide shoulders and extra space on either side of the pavement to accommodate the gargantuan passenger vehicles, as well as the trucks. Much of this extra space could be used for more lanes for actual travel. Furthermore, whereas pavements and bridges must now be designed for heavy concentrated wheel loads, a lighter, air-supported vehicle would only require design for the smaller vehicle load weight distributed over its entire base area. Substantial savings in the cost per mile of roadway would result.

Whatever form future vehicles may take, two things appear certain: There is a continuing need for individual transportation vehicles in America and there is an urgent need for improved mass transportation facilities in the big metropolitan area.

FRANCO-GERMAN COOPERATION—STATEMENT BY FOREIGN MINISTER VON BRENTANO

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, we live in a time of almost desperate need for

mutual trust and full cooperation and understanding among the members of the Atlantic community. Therefore, it is always unfortunate when a misinterpretation of events places even the slightest, unnecessary strain upon the relationships within this great community.

Such an incident has been brought to my attention, and I should like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

Early in January of this year, there appeared a newspaper report in which it was alleged that Foreign Minister Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, of the Federal Republic of Germany, remarked to a leading European statesman, during a conversation at the end of last year:

> Don't worry too much about the French. In another 6 years Germany—not France—will be directing affairs.

I am very happy to insert here a correction, which appeared in the Washington Post of January 18. By the way, the Post was not the newspaper which published the original report. The correction reads as follows:

> Von Brentano himself issued a statement contending the report of his remark was "not based on facts."
>
> "I have never made this or any similar remark," said the Foreign Minister.

I know that Dr. von Brentano was one of the first Western leaders to champion effective steps to forge close ties between France and Germany. I should like to refer particularly to the Foreign Minister's remarks last year, at a luncheon in his honor, which I attended, together with many of my distinguished colleagues. In answer to a question on Franco-German cooperation, the Foreign Minister said:

> I am particularly happy to state here that our French neighbors think exactly along the same lines. I think never in history has there been an epoch where Franco-German relationships were so close and were so frank, that there has never been a friendship like this existing between the two countries, and there is the same understanding of our joint common task in France as it is in Germany.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska's industrial and agricultural vigor belies its age.

The 94 years which have passed since statehood came to my State have not slowed down its pace of expansion and development. The earliest days found our State rapidly growing with homesteaders, expanding with railroads, and developing with the construction of a State University.

Nowadays, with farm technology, irrigation, and soil culture our progress in the major field of agriculture is steady and solid.

And with the development of our livestock industry, our State is marked as a pacesetter in the Farm Belt.

The industries which have located in the State in the last 10 years are the best proof of its potential and bright future. We are keeping abreast of new developments, as seen with the Hallam sodium reactor plant, through which we hope to branch out into several uses of the fissionable materials which will be made available as a result.

On this anniversary of Nebraska's admission to statehood, we can take pride in our progress as a solvent, leading agricultural and industrial State.

GREETINGS TO HELEN HAYES AND RENE BOUCHET

(During the delivery of the statement of Mr. LONG of Louisiana on the Federal inventions bill:)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senate that today I have been honored to entertain—and I think this is just as true of my colleague from New York—a guest from New York, the first lady of the theater, Helen Hayes. I think it would be a nice gesture if Senators could have an opportunity to have a word with her.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join my colleague in greeting Helen Hayes.

Also, while we are on the subject of the arts, I have had the honor of the company of Mr. Rene Bouchet, the eminent artist, who is known to many Members of the Senate. If there were more Members present in the Chamber, I am sure that Mr. Bouchet would be pleased to sketch the Senate in session. However, I believe this would not be the appropriate time to do so. I think Mr. Bouchet would like to have the opportunity to meet Senators on this occasion of his visit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senators on their guests, and I point out to the senior Senator from New York that my favorite picture of the U.S. Senate is one in which there are no more Senators in the Chamber than there are at this time. Perhaps he has seen the picture.

FEDERAL INVENTIONS ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the United States is desperately engaged in a scientific and technological struggle, upon the outcome of which our national survival may depend. This has placed upon the citizens of the United States an unprecedented financial burden imposed by the necessities of national security.

The departments and agencies of the U.S. Government are increasingly responsible for scientific and technological developments achieved in the United States. During 1959, $7.9 billion of a total of $13.2 billion, or 60 percent of all research and development performed by industry, was financed by the Federal Government through research and development and procurement contracts. Government outlays for this purpose increased in 1960, and will continue to increase in the years to come.

The Department of Defense and its military departments have been responsible for over three-quarters of the scientific and technological research and development undertaken by the U.S. Government. This amounted to about $6 billion in 1959.

The end products of research and development are knowledge, techniques, data, prototypes, and all the rights appertaining thereto, and this is what the Government pays for. What it gets depends on its patent policies.

There is no one Government patent policy. Various Federal agencies and departments have sharply varying policies with regard to taking title to patentable inventions made under research and development contracts with private organizations. In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Agriculture, the law requires that the Government take title to all inventions resulting from Government-financed research. Congress created this policy by statute. Other policies go to the extreme of automatically giving away all commercial rights to the firm doing research, as in the case of the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, and the National Science Foundation.

Whenever the Congress has enacted specific legislation governing the disposition by particular Government departments of the results of Government-financed research and development, it has always provided for the retention of adequate rights by the United States, thus making such results available to all our people. This is an important condition for scientific and economic growth as well as the maintenance of our free enterprise system.

Many Members of Congress have thought about this problem and have come to the same conclusion—that where the Government pays for research, it should obtain patent rights in any resulting invention or discovery so that these may be available for the use of all the people, instead of just a favored few. I joined the distinguished Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], Tennessee [Mr. GORE], Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and others who fought for this principle in the atomic energy field in 1954. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also reached this conclusion for the coal research and development bill—H.R. 3375, now Public Law 599—helium gas bill—H.R. 10548, now Public Law 777—and the saline water bill—S. 3557—which was passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress. The provisions of the Atomic Energy Act were also reenacted in the first session of the last Congress.

In those cases where Congress failed to establish mandatory requirements to retain for the United States the rights to the results of Government-financed research, some departments and agencies, without express statutory authorization, have surrendered, and continue to surrender, to private contractors what rightfully belongs to the public. In many instances these departments have reserved inadequate rights, or no rights whatever, to the use of Government-financed inventions or to information necessary for the practice of such inventions.

Under the practices of the Department of Defense, the Post Office Depart-

ment, the Treasury Department, and the National Science Foundation, scientific and technological developments, achieved through the expenditure of large sums of public money, have become the private property of private contractors or grantees, to be used by them for their exclusive commercial advantage and in derogation of the public interest.

By such practices, those departments and agencies have done the following:

First. They have conferred upon commercial enterprises, monopolies in the use of scientific and technical developments made through the expenditure of public funds, and have contributed thereby to the increased concentration of economic power in industry contrary to the purpose of the antitrust laws of the United States.

Second. They have deprived the small business community of free access to the use of such developments, thereby restraining their survival and growth, contrary to the national interest.

Third. They have curtailed the dissemination and use of scientific and technical information, thereby impeding scientific and economic progress within the United States.

Mr. President, the patent laws enacted by the Congress were intended to promote the progress of science and useful arts. They were not enacted to curtail the use of scientific and technological developments at the expense of the public welfare. Nor were they designed to provide a device for the monopolization for private gain of knowledge and inventions attained through the use of public funds or facilities.

As in the case of other purchases made by the Government, the United States should acquire title and full rights of use and disposition of scientific and technical information, as well as inventions for which it has paid. These should be held by the U.S. Government for the benefit of the people of the United States, and should be administered and used to promote to the fullest extent the interests of the United States and its citizens.

This Nation cannot afford to dissipate, for the private gain of a small number of commercial organizations, the achievements of the individual scientists and technologists upon whom the Nation must rely in its effort to attain that technological eminence upon which our safety in large part depends.

It is imperative that the Congress of the United States safeguard and promote the public interest in scientific and technological discoveries and inventions resulting from the expenditure of public funds or through the use of public facilities. In this way the following objectives will be attained:

First. It will make the benefits of Government-financed discoveries and inventions available to the public at the earliest practicable time and at the lowest possible cost.

Second. It will help to disseminate rapidly knowledge so developed and to stimulate invention and innovation for the purpose of achieving economies in production, developing new and better industrial products, and increasing the productivity of industry through advanced technological methods.

Third. It will retard the growth of monopoly and the concentration of economic power which inevitably results from the accumulation by a few commercial organizations of exclusive rights to the results of Government-financed research.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill, the culmination of 3 years of intensive study, which will provide for the retention by the United States of full proprietary rights to all scientific and technological discoveries and inventions resulting from the application of resources of the U.S. Government, and which will also provide for the administration and use of its proprietary rights to promote in the public interest the maximum practicable dissemination and use within the United States of those discoveries.

For that purpose there would be established by this bill a Federal Inventions Administration which would be affirmatively charged with the duty of administering the provisions of this act and protecting the public interest in scientific and technological developments achieved through the activities of departments and agencies of the United States and through contracts and leases entered into and grants made by or on behalf of such departments and agencies.

It is the further purpose of this bill to stimulate discovery and invention in the public interest by providing for the making of generous monetary awards to all persons who contribute to the United States for public use scientific and technological discoveries of significant value in the fields of national defense or public health, or to any national scientific program, without regard to the patentability of the contributions so made.

Mr. President, in order to achieve these objectives, I am introducing a bill called the Federal Inventions Act, which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference, and I request unanimous consent that the text thereof be published in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 1176) to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition and disposition of proprietary rights in scientific and technical information obtained and inventions made through the expenditure of public funds; to establish in the executive branch of the Government a Federal Inventions Administration to administer in the public interest the proprietary rights of the United States with respect to such information and inventions; to encourage the contribution to the United States of inventions of significant value for national defense, public health, or any national scientific program; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Inventions Administration Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Administration" means the Federal Inventions Administration.

(b) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Federal Inventions.

(c) The term "executive agency" includes any executive or military department of the United States, any independent establishment (other than the Administration) in the executive branch of the Government, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and any wholly owned Government corporation.

(d) The term "agency head" means the head of any executive agency, except that (1) the Secretary of Defense shall be the agency head of the Department of Defense and of each military department thereof, and (2) in the case of any authority, commission, or other agency control over which is exercised by more than one individual such terms means the body exercising such control.

(e) The term "contract" means any actual or proposed contract, agreement, understanding, or other arrangement between any executive agency and any other person for the acquisition of any property by or on behalf of any executive agency or for the rendition of any service for or on behalf of any executive agency, and includes any assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract of any tier executed or entered into for or in connection with the performance of that contract.

(f) The term "person" includes any individual and any corporation, partnership, firm, association, institution, or other entity.

(g) The term "invention" means any invention, discovery, improvement, or innovation, without regard to the patentability thereof.

(h) The term "class," when used with regard to inventions, means any class or subclass of inventions under the classification system of the Patent Office.

(i) The term "made", when used in relation to any invention, means the conception or first actual reduction to practice of such invention.

PROPRIETARY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN INVENTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The United States shall have exclusive right and title to any invention made by any officer or employee of the United States or any executive agency if—

(1) the invention was made in the performance by such officer or employee of duties which he was employed or assigned to perform, and was made during working hours or with a contribution by the Government of (A) the use of Government facilities, equipment, materials, or funds, (B) information in which the Government had a proprietary interest, or (C) the services of any other officer or employee of the Government during working hours; or

(2) the officer or employee who made such invention was employed or assigned to perform research, development, or exploration work and the invention is directly related to the work he was employed or assigned to perform or was made within the scope of the duties of his employment.

(b) The United States shall have exclusive right and title to any invention made by any other person if the invention—

(1) was made in the performance by such person of any obligation arising from a contract or lease executed or grant made by or on behalf of an executive agency, and is directly related to the subject matter of such contract; or

(2) resulted from any activity undertaken in the performance of services under any contract or lease executed or grant made

by or on behalf of an executive agency for work involving scientific or technological research, development, or exploration.

(c) Any patent issued by the Commissioner of Patents for any such invention shall be issued or assigned by the Commissioner to the United States upon application made by the Administrator.

FEDERAL INVENTIONS ADMINISTRATION ESTABLISHED

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government the Federal Inventions Administration. It is the duty of the Administration, in the performance of its functions, to protect, promote, and administer the proprietary interests of the United States with respect to inventions made and scientific and technological information obtained through activities conducted by executive agencies and through contracts and leases entered into and grants made by or on behalf of such agencies.

(b) The Administration shall be headed by an Administrator of Federal Inventions, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for officers named in section 104(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956.

(c) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Administrator of Federal Inventions who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for officers named in section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Administrator shall prescribe. During the absence or disability of the Administrator, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator, the Deputy Administrator shall act as Administrator.

(d) There shall be in the Administration a General Counsel who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for officers named in section 106(b)(9) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956. The General Counsel shall be the chief legal officer of the Administration, and shall perform such duties as the Administrator may direct. During the absence or disability, or in the event of vacancies in the offices, of the Administrator and the Deputy Administrator, the General Counsel shall act as Administrator.

(e) The Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and the General Counsel may not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving as such. No individual shall be appointed or serve as Administrator, Deputy Administrator, or General Counsel—

(1) while he holds legal title to, or beneficial equitable interest in, share capital (A) exceeding in market value $ in any corporation engaged in the performance of any contract or lease entered into by or on behalf of any executive agency, or (B) exceeding in market value $ in more than one such corporation; or

(2) if within years he has served as an officer or director of any such corporation; or

(3) if within years he has been affiliated in any capacity with any partnership, association, institution, or other legal entity which is engaged in the performance of any service under any contract or lease entered into or grant made by or on behalf of any executive agency.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall be responsible for the exercise of all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Administration and shall have authority to direct and supervise all personnel and activities thereof.

(b) The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required for the performance of the functions of the Administration. The Administrator may procure, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the temporary and intermittent services of individuals and organizations to the same extent as authorized for executive departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for the personal services of individuals. With the prior consent of the agency head of any executive agency, the Administrator may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such agency as the Administrator deems advisable.

(c) The Administrator may establish such advisory committees as he may determine to be appropriate to provide to the Administration necessary consultation, advice, and information relating to its functions and the performance thereof.

(d) The Administrator may promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in him or in the Administration, and he may delegate authority for the performance of any such function to any officer or employee under his direction and supervision.

(e) The Administrator shall—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he determines to be required for the fulfillment by executive agencies of their obligations under any provision of law relating to the proprietary interests of the United States in inventions and in scientific and technological information; and

(2) conduct from time to time such studies and investigations of the policies and practices of executive agencies relating to the proprietary interests of the United States with regard to inventions and scientific and technological information as he determines to be required for the performance of the duties of the Administration.

(f) Upon request made by the Administrator, the Commissioner of Patents and each executive agency shall furnish to the Administration such information and documents (including pending patent applications) as the Administrator may determine to be required for the performance of the duties of the Administration under this Act. Upon request made by the Administrator, the Attorney General shall initiate and conduct such legal proceedings as may be required for the protection and preservation of the proprietary interest of the United States in any invention or with respect to any scientific or technological information.

(g) The Administrator shall cause a seal of office to be made for the administration of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(h) The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include—

(1) a comprehensive description of the activities and accomplishments of the administration during the preceding calendar year;

(2) a detailed statement of the nature and effect of any disposal made during the preceding calendar year of any proprietary rights of the United States in inventions or scientific or technological information; and

(3) such recommendations for additional legislation as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to protect the proprietary interests of the United States with respect to inventions and scientific and technological information.

(i) Upon request made by the chairman of any committee of the Congress having jurisdiction over the subject matter, or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, the Administrator shall conduct such special studies, make such special reports, and furnish such information to such committee or subcommittee as such committee or subcommittee may determine to be required for the discharge of its responsibilities concerning the proprietary interests of the United States with respect to inventions and scientific and technological information obtained through the performance of services under contracts and leases entered into and grants made by executive agencies.

ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT RIGHTS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator shall—

(1) make application to the Commissioner of Patents, and when determined by the Administrator to be in the interest of the United States to the apropriate officers of foreign governments, for the issuance to the United States of patents upon patentable inventions as to which the United States has proprietary rights;

(2) take such action as may be required for the prosecution of those applications in the interest of the United States;

(3) take title in the name of the United States to all patents issued or assigned to, and all interests in patents, proprietary rights to inventions, and technical information with respect to inventions acquired by, the United States or any executive agency; and

(4) maintain custody of and control over all documents evidencing the title or interest possessed by the United States with respect to any patent.

(b) The Administrator shall take such action as he determines to be required to—

(1) protect and preserve the proprietary rights of the United States with respect to patents, inventions, and scientific or technological information; and

(2) effectuate the dedication for public use of the proprietary rights of the United States with respect to any patent if he determines that such action will best promote the public policy declared by this Act.

COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL INFORMATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Administration shall—

(1) prepare and maintain such indexes and other compilations of information as may be required to determine the nature and scope of the proprietary interests of the United States in inventions and in scientific and technical information;

(2) provide suitable repositories for, and schedules and compilations reflecting the nature and scope of, technical information obtained by the United States through the scientific and technological activities conducted by executive agencies and by other organizations incident to the performance of services under contracts and leases entered into and grants made by or on behalf of executive agencies; and

(3) make available to each executive agency (including the military departments) all scientific and technical information available to the Administrator which may have value to such executive agency in the performance of its functions.

(b) In order to provide for the prompt public dissemination, to the maximum extent consistent with the requirements of military security, of scientific and technological information, and to promote the widest and fullest possible use thereof in the public interest, the Administration shall—

(1) obtain, assemble, and classify available publications and other information

concerning inventions and discoveries which may provide assistance for inventors, small business organizations, and the general public;

(2) evaluate all scientific and technological information available to the Administration to determine its probable application to commercial uses in the development of new and better products and advanced technological methods of production;

(3) compile, publish, and provide for the greatest practicable distribution to libraries, trade associations, and organizations engaged in trade and industry of publications disclosing the results of such evaluation to the end that inventors and industrial and trade organizations may receive promptly information concerning new inventions and discoveries relating to their fields of special interest; and

(4) conduct such economic research as may be required to evaluate the contributions made by the Administration through its activities to the growth of the trade and commerce of the United States and to the stimulation of competition among private enterprises engaged in such trade and commerce.

(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer of any other executive agency authority for the performance, subject to direction, supervision and control by the Administrator, of any function of the Administration under this section.

LICENSES FOR USE OF INVENTIONS IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES HAS A PROPRIETARY INTEREST

SEC. 8. (a) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, and upon the payment of such processing fee not exceeding $25.00 as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable, the Authority shall grant to any person (subject to such conditions as the Administrator may determine to be required in the public interest) a nonexclusive royalty free license for the use of any patent held by the United States, or the nonexclusive assignment without compensation of any interest of the United States in any patent, or access to any technical or scientific information possessed by the United States, if the Administrator determines that such grant will facilitate—

(1) the performance of the obligations of such person under any contract or lease entered into or grant made by or on behalf of any executive agency;

(2) the fulfillment of the obligations of the United States or any executive agency to or with respect to any friendly foreign government under any treaty or intergovernmental agreement; or

(3) the attainment of the objectives of any program lawfully undertaken under any statute of the United States.

(b) Under such nondiscriminatory regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, and subject to the requirements of this subsection, the Administration may grant to any person for purposes of commercial exploitation a license for the use of any patent held by the United States, the assignment of the interest of the United States in any patent, or access (subject to the requirements of military security) to any technical or scientific information possessed by the United States. Each grant made by the Administrator under this subsection shall be made for such period of time and upon such terms and conditions (including the payment of such royalties or other fees) as the Administrator shall determine to be just and equitable. Each such grant shall be conditioned upon the submission by the grantee to the Administrator of an annual report which shall contain a full and complete disclosure of the nature and extent of the uses made of the invention to which such grant relates during the preceding year. No such grant may be made unless the Administrator has prepared a written report containing a description of the nature and terms of the grant made and a full and complete statement of the basis for his determination that such grant is not in derogation of the public interest and that the terms thereof are just and equitable. A copy of the report so made with respect to each such grant shall be retained by the Administration as a public record for the duration of the grant so made, and for such additional period as the Administrator by regulation may prescribe.

(c) The Administrator shall deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all royalties and other fees received under the provisions of grants made pursuant to this section.

PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN INVENTIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Whenever an application is made to the Commissioner of Patents for a patent upon an invention made by an individual who at the time of the making of such invention was an officer or employee of the United States or any executive agency, such application shall be accompanied by a full and complete statement, executed under oath and prepared in such manner and form as the Commissioner shall prescribe, disclosing the relationship (if any) of the making of that invention to the performance by that individual of his duties as such officer or employee.

(b) Whenever an application is made to the Commissioner of Patents for a patent upon any invention made by any individual who at the time of the making of such invention was a party, or an officer, employee, partner, or other member of any organization which was a party, to any contract or lease executed or any grant made by or on behalf of any executive agency, such application shall be accompanied by a full and complete statement, executed under oath and prepared in such manner and form as the Commissioner shall prescribe, disclosing the relationship (if any) of the making of such invention to the performance of any obligation arising from any such contract, lease, or grant.

(c) A copy of each statement made under subsection (a) or subsection (b), and a copy of the application to which it relates, shall be transmitted promptly by the Commissioner to the Administrator. Upon any application as to which any such statement has been so transmitted, the Commissioner may, if he determines that the invention is patentable, issue a patent to the applicant unless the Administrator, within ninety days after receipt of such application and statement and after consultation with the executive agency concerned, requests that any patent issued upon such invention be assigned without consideration to the Administrator on behalf of the United States. If, within such time, the Administrator files such a request with the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall transmit notice thereof to the applicant, and shall so assign to the Administrator any patent which may be issued upon that invention unless the applicant within a period of thirty days after receipt of such notice requests a hearing before a Board of Patent Interferences on the question whether the Administrator is entitled under the provisions of this Act to receive such assignment on behalf of the United States. If, within that period, the applicant requests such a hearing, the Board shall hear and determine, in accordance with rules and procedures established for interference cases, the question so presented. Its determination thereof shall be subject to appeal by the applicant or by the Administrator in accordance with procedures governing appeals from decisions of a Board of Patent Interferences in other proceedings.

(d) Whenever any patent has been issued to any applicant, and the Administrator thereafter has reason to believe that such applicant was obligated to file with his application the statement required by subsection (a) or subsection (b) but failed to file such statement, or that the statement which was filed by the applicant in connection therewith contained any false or misleading representation of any material fact, the Administrator within five years after the date of issuance of such patent may file with the Commissioner a request for the assignment to the Administrator of title to such patent on the records of the Commissioner. Notice of any such request shall be transmitted by the Commissioner to the owner of record of such patent, and title to such patent shall be so assigned to the Administrator unless within 30 days after receipt of such notice such owner of record requests a hearing before a Board of Patent Interferences on the question whether that invention was made under circumstances which entitle the Administrator to receive an assignment of title thereto under the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (b). Such question shall be heard and determined, and determination thereof shall be subject to review, in the manner prescribed by subsection (c) for questions arising thereunder. No request made by the Administrator under this subsection for the assignment of any patent, and no prosecution for the violation of any criminal statute, shall be barred by any failure of the Administrator to make a request under subsection (c) for the assignment of such patent to him, or by any notice previously given by the Administrator stating that he had no objection to the issuance of such patent to the applicant therefor.

WAIVER OF PROPRIETARY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN INVENTIONS

SEC. 10. (a) Under such regulations in conformity with the provisions of this section as the Administrator shall prescribe, he may waive all or any part of the proprietary rights of the United States under this Act with respect to any invention or class of inventions made or which thereafter may be made by any person or class of persons in the performance of obligations arising under any contract or lease or class of contracts or leases entered into or to be entered into, or any grant or class of grants made or to be made, by or on behalf of any executive agency if—

(1) the Administrator has determined that—

(A) no adequate arrangement can be made for the effective conduct of the research or developmental activity required without the granting of such waiver;

(B) the contribution of funds, facilities, and proprietary information made or to be made by the recipient or recipients of such waiver to the making of that invention or class of inventions so far exceeds, or will so far exceed, the contribution made thereto by the United States Government that equitable considerations favor the granting of such waiver; and

(C) the granting of such waiver would affirmatively advance the interests of the United States and would be consistent with the public policy declared by this Act; and

(2) the Administrator has received a written determination made by the Attorney General to the effect that the granting of such waiver would not facilitate—

(A) the growth or maintenance of monopolistic control by any person of any product or service, or any class of products or services, offered or to be offered for sale in the trade or commerce of the United States; or

(B) the concentration of economic power with respect to any part of the trade or commerce of the United States.

(b) Each such waiver must contain such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be effective to—

(1) insure that the recipient thereof will conduct actively and effectively such research and other activities as may be required for the attainment of the objectives of the Federal program or programs to which the invention or class of inventions relates;

(2) insure that the recipient thereof will at his own expense—

(A) promptly apply for such patents as the Administrator shall designate upon any patentable invention made in consequence of activities undertaken pursuant to such contract, lease, or grant;

(B) prosecute each such application diligently; and

(C) take such action as the Administrator shall determine to be required for the protection of each patent issued upon any such application and the interest retained by the United States therein;

(3) permit the Administrator, in the event of the failure of the recipient thereof to fulfill any obligation undertaken in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2), to take such action, at the expense of the recipient of such waiver, as the Administrator shall determine to be required for the fulfillment of such obligation;

(4) reserve to the United States an irrevocable license for the practice of such invention, and the use of technical information relating thereto, throughout the world by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States; and

(5) insure that the recipient thereof will take such other action as the Administrator may determine to be required for the protection of the interests of the United States and to be consistent with the public policy declared by this Act.

PROVISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, LEASES, AND GRANTS

SEC. 11. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), each contract, lease, and grant entered into or made by or on behalf of any executive agency shall contain provisions determined by the Administrator with the written approval of the Attorney General to be adequate for the protection of the proprietary interests of the United States in inventions and scientific and technical information.

(b) The Administrator by regulations may except from the requirement of subsection (a) those contracts, leases, and grants, and those classes of contracts, leases, and grants which he has determined with the written approval of the Attorney General to involve no proprietary interest of the United States in inventions or in scientific or technical information. No such exemption may be made unless the Administrator has prepared a written report containing a description of the nature and extent of such exemption, and a full and complete statement of the basis for his determination that the contracts, leases, or grants, or the classes of contracts, leases, or grants, described therein involve no proprietary interest of the United States in inventions or in scientific or technical information. A copy of each such report shall be retained by the Authority as a public record thereof during the effective period of every contract, lease, or grant of any class described therein and for not less than one year thereafter.

(c) Each contract or lease entered into and each grant made by or on behalf of any executive agency which is required by this section to contain provisions for the protection of the proprietary interests of the United States shall also contain provisions determined by the Administrator with the written approval of the Attorney General to be sufficient to require such person to furnish promptly to the United States, at such time or times as shall be prescribed in such provisions, full and complete technical information concerning any invention which may be made in the performance of any obligation of such person under the terms of that contract, lease, or grant.

AWARDS FOR CERTAIN INVENTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 12. (a) Upon application made by any person or upon the recommendation of the agency head of any executive agency, the Administrator is authorized to make a monetary award, in such amount and upon such terms as he shall determine to be warranted, to any person for any scientific, technical, or medical contribution to the United States which is determined by the Administrator to have significant value to national defense, public health, or any program administered by any executive agency pursuant to authorization conferred by any statute enacted by the Congress.

(b) Each application and recommendation made for any such award shall be referred to a board which shall be convened within the Administration to evaluate the significance of such contribution and which shall be composed of members determined by the Administrator to be qualified by training and experience to make such evaluation. Such board shall accord to each person who has made such application or has been recommended for such award an opportunity for hearing, and shall transmit to the Administrator a written report containing its findings of fact, its conclusions, and its recommendation as to the terms of the award, if any, which should be made to such person for such contribution.

(c) In determining the terms and conditions of any award to be made under this section, the Administrator shall take into account—

(1) the value of the contribution to the United States;

(2) the extent to which the person concerned has devoted his private funds, facilities, proprietary information, and personal effort to the development of such contribution;

(3) the amount of any compensation (other than salary received for services rendered as an officer or employee of the United States or any executive agency) previously received by such person for or on account of the use of such contribution by the United States; and

(4) such other factors consistent with the public policy declared by this Act as the Administrator shall determine to be material.

(d) If more than one person claims an interest in the same contribution, the Administrator shall ascertain and determine the respective interests of such persons, and shall apportion any award to be made with respect to such contribution among such persons in such proportions as he shall determine to be equitable. No award may be made under this section to any person with respect to any contribution—

(1) unless such person surrenders, by such means as the Administrator with the written approval of the Attorney General shall determine to be effective, all claims which such person may have to receive any compensation (other than the award made under this section) for the use of such contribution or any element thereof at any time by or on behalf of the United States, or by or on behalf of any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States, within the United States or at any other place; or

(2) in any amount exceeding $100,000, unless the Administrator has transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress a full and complete report concerning the amount and terms of, and the basis for, such proposed award, and thirty calendar days of regular session of the Congress have expired after receipt of such report by such committees.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 13. (a) All functions, powers, duties, and obligations; all officers, employees, property, and records; and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), of the following agencies or parts of agencies, are hereby transferred to the Administration:

(1) the Government Patents Board established by Executive Order No. 10096 promulgated January 23, 1950 (15 F.R. 389); and

(2) those elements of the Department of Commerce or any other executive agency which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be engaged primarily in the performance of functions which by this Act are made functions of the Administration.

(b) This section shall take effect on the effective date prescribed by section 15 of this Act, or on such earlier date on which the Administrator determines, and announces by proclamation published in the Federal Register, that the Administration has been organized and is prepared to exercise the powers conferred and discharge the duties imposed upon it by this Act.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 14. (a) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out in section 3(d) thereof (40 U.S.C. 472(d)) the words "and (3) records of the Federal Government", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "(3) proprietary interests of the United States in inventions under the Federal Inventions Administration Act; and (4) records of the Federal Government"; and

(2) inserting at the end of section 302 thereof (41 U.S.C. 252) the following new subsection:

"(f) All purchases and contracts for property and services shall be made in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

(b) Title 10 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of section 2306 thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) All purchases and contracts subject to the provisions of this chapter shall be made in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

(c) The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by—

(1) striking out sections 305 and 306 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2457–2458); and

(2) inserting at the end of section 203 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2473) the following new subsections:

"(c) For the purposes of chapter 17 of title 35 of the United States Code the Administration shall be considered a defense agency of the United States.

"(d) All contracts, agreements, arrangements, conveyances, and grants entered into or made by the Administration shall be subject to the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

(d) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by striking out section 152 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2182), but nothing contained in this Act shall affect or impair the provisions of sections 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, or 160 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2181 and 2183–2190, inclusive), or any authority conferred upon the Atomic Energy Commission by such sections.

(e) The Act of May 28, 1933 (48 Stat. 58) as amended (establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority) is amended by—

(1) striking out the colon which appears first in subsection 5(i) thereof (16 U.S.C. 831d(i)) and all thereafter down to the period at the end of such subsection; and

(2) adding at the end of the first paragraph of subsection 9(b) thereof (16 U.S.C. 831h(b)) the following new sentence: "All purchases and contracts for supplies or services shall be made in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

(f) The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by—

(1) striking out section 12 thereof (42 U.S.C. 1871); and

(2) adding at the end of section 15 thereof (42 U.S.C. 1873) the following new subsection:

"(j) Every contract, lease, grant, agreement, understanding, or other arrangement made or entered into by or on behalf of the Foundation shall be subject to the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

(g) The seventh sentence of section 10(a) of the Act of June 29, 1935, as added by section 101 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1085, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 427i(a)), relating to agricultural research, is amended to read as follows: "Any contract, lease, grant, agreement, understanding, or other arrangement made or entered into pursuant to this authority shall be subject to the requirements of the Federal Inventions Administration Act."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. (a) This Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act except that sections 2, 4, and 5 thereof shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any invention related to the performance of obligations arising under any contract or lease entered into or grant made by or on behalf of any executive agency other than the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at any time before the effective date of this Act, or to any amendment, modification, or extension of any such contract, lease, or grant if that amendment, modification, or extension is entered into within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Each such contract, grant, modification, or extension shall be governed by applicable law in effect on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each department and agency of the Government charged with any responsibility under this Act such sums as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this Act which are applicable to that department or agency.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I previously mentioned, the Federal Government is deeply involved in and is increasingly responsible for scientific and technological developments achieved in the United States. These developments, which go far beyond the problems of Government patent policies, have a very important influence on our economic growth, on the progress of science, and on the maintenance of a competitive, free-enterprise system. Yet neither the Congress nor any other agency of the Government seems to be concerned with such problems. These problems cut across the interests of the Small Business Committee, the Patent and Antimonopoly Subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and other committees.

I am, therefore, submitting a resolution which will establish for a 2-year period a Select Committee on Technological Developments, which would make an intensive study of the extent to which activities of the U.S. Government are responsible for scientific and technological developments within the United States; the kinds of policies and practices which have been and are being employed by the Government in furtherance of such activities; the effect of such policies on the scientific, technical, and economic progress of the United States and upon the structure of its economy; and ways and means whereby those developments can be applied more rapidly and more widely to strengthen the national economy for the contest with the Communist bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 103), submitted by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Technological Developments (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") consisting of nine Members of the Senate, of whom six shall be members of the majority party and three shall be members of the minority party. Members and the chairman thereof shall be appointed by the President of the Senate. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(b) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate. A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(c) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

(d) The committee shall cease to exist on January 31, 1963.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation with respect to—

(1) the extent to which activities of the departments and agencies of the United States Government, undertaken directly or through the employment of facilities of private contractors and grantees for research and development, are responsible for scientific and technological developments achieved within the United States;

(2) the policies, practices, and standards which have been employed and are being employed by such departments and agencies, and contractors and grantees thereof, with respect to the acquisition, disposition, and use of inventions and technical information resulting from such activities of those departments and agencies;

(3) the effect of such policies, practices, and standards, and the developments incident thereto, upon the scientific, technical, and economic progress of the United States and upon the structure of the economy of the United States; and

(4) the nature and extent of action which is required for the establishment in the national interest of a uniform policy governing the policies, practices, and standards of all such departments and agencies, and contractors and grantees thereof, with respect to the acquisition, disposition and use of inventions and scientific and technical information resulting directly or indirectly from the activities of such departments and agencies.

(b) On or before January 31 of each year, the Committee shall report to the Senate the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of problems incident to the acquisition, disposition, and use of inventions and scientific and technical information resulting directly or indirectly from activities of departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the Committee selected from the minority party, the Committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the Committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the Committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the Committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the Committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000 through January 31, 1962, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING ON U.S. DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. KEATING] a bill, which would increase competitive bidding on U.S. defense contracts and channel more defense orders to labor surplus areas. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, dean of the Democratic New York congressional delegation, will introduce the same measure today in the House of Representatives.

Representative CELLER and I are asking the other 43 members of the New York State congressional delegation to back the measure, as they did in 1959.

The bill would strengthen the requirements for competitive bidding in the awarding of defense contracts and would prevent the Defense Department from using loopholes in the current law to avoid competitive bidding. In addition, the bill would require the Defense Department to make a fair proportion of purchases in labor surplus areas and authorize bidding on such purchases to be limited to industries in those areas.

The proposed legislation is aimed at reversing the growing trend of defense contract awards to California and to other States in the Far West at the expense of many industries located in New York and other parts of the East. Open bidding would give qualified New York industries greater opportunity to compete for an increased share of defense business.

I am disappointed in the results so far of President Kennedy's directive to the Defense Department ordering contracts channeled to areas of labor surplus, of which there are 13 in New York State, some of them very large. The bill would improve the machinery so as to give the high-unemployment areas a bigger share of the preferential contracts.

An analysis of defense procurement, recently prepared by me, showed that the share of prime defense contracts awarded industries in New York State increased during the first quarter of the current fiscal year. It disclosed that a total of $628,162,000 in major military contracts, or about 12½ percent of all such awards, went to New York firms for the July–September 1960 period. But the analysis showed that California, with $1,131,819,000 in contracts, continues to receive almost double the value of defense procurement awarded to firms in any other State in the Union.

This is more than simply a problem for New York State. Everyone who believes in open, competitive bidding should back this measure. Open bidding is now applied—and this is very significant—to only about $3 billion of the $23 billion awarded in defense contracts. It is time we insisted upon more competition in defense orders to give everyone a chance to compete for this business.

Moreover, this bill would be effective in channeling a more substantial number of defense contracts to areas of high unemployment. The Defense Department program of preferential contracts in areas of labor surplus has not been adequate, because there are too many "ifs" attached to the program. Since 1958, for example, only slightly more than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total contracts awarded by the Defense Department were preferential; and during this same period, only slightly more than 1 percent of defense contracts awarded to labor surplus areas were preferential. New York State's share of preferential contracts has been even smaller than the national average.

Thus, the "preferential" contract program has been of little help to unemployment in those areas. This bill would improve the machinery for funneling these contracts to labor surplus areas. Even these contracts, I should add, would be awarded on a competitive basis, by authorizing the Defense Department to limit the bidding to industries in the labor surplus areas.

Thus, this bill would be also an effective antirecession measure that would not only aid distressed areas but promote competitive bidding as well.

What is needed now is an implementation of President Kennedy's directive upon this subject.

Mr. President, I add, with respect to the bill, that my colleague [Mr. KEATING] will introduce a bill shortly, I assume, generally upon the same subject, as to which I have the honor to join. He will, of course, explain the bill himself.

I feel that all of us are simply trying to right a balance which has not been righted, not by any artificial activity but solely as a result of a national policy which will take some cognizance of labor surplus areas, of which we in New York have more than our share, and, second, which will give a chance to industries in New York, which are highly competent and extremely mechanized, to have some share of these defense contracts more commensurate with their power and size with reference to the total industrial machine of the country.

We believe, whether by convenience or simple inertia, the balance has shifted in a way which is unwise in terms of the Nation. We do not blame anybody. I have complimented my friend the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] before for the fact that his State has perhaps been on the ball and able to get twice the business we in New York have.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. President, we want an opportunity to strike a blow for freedom in a competitive way. We feel that when $3 billion out of $23 billion in defense contracts is all that is really subject to open bidding it is time to make some change. The purpose of the bill is to make some change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1178) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield, of course.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say that I have been detained with the Republican and Democratic leadership at another meeting, and I apologize for the lateness of my arrival.

I also wish to say by way of introduction that I have no better friends in the Senate than the two able Senators from New York. They represent their State admirably and vigorously, as is their duty. And they have discharged that duty well. Having said that, I wish to ask my able friend the senior Senator from New York whether he contends that the Defense Department has ever been guilty of favoritism in any fashion in awarding defense contracts.

Mr. JAVITS. I have not made and do not make any such contention, except that I would not wish that statement to represent what we lawyers call an estoppel, so that I cannot make the contention at some other time if I find there is evidence to support it. I can say now that there is no evidence to support any such charge, so I have not made it.

I should like to point out to my colleague that in my affirmative statement I made it very clear that California is doing fine, and that is great. The people of that State pay taxes, too. But at the same time we want a fair chance, in terms of the size and power of New York industry, to compete for this business.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. When the able Governor of the able State of New York opens an office in the great city of Los Angeles in an endeavor to attract business from my State to his, the people of California do not quarrel with such action. I do not quarrel with it. At a proper time I hope to be able to read and reflect upon the comments made here earlier by my two good friends from New York. But I say now that the people of the State of California have a right to ask fairplay—no more and no less—from the Government of the United States in any procurement policies which it follows, and that is all the Senator from California has to say with respect to the awarding of defense contracts. That is all any Senator has a right to demand.

I congratulate my friend for frankly stating here today that no charge of favoritism is being made by the Senators from New York in connection with expenditures on a multimillion dollar program, which he and his colleague, the Presiding Officer and I, and the rest of us will all concede—nay, we demand—be expended for one, single, solitary purpose, and that is to give the people of the United States the proper strength and posture of defense to deter potential aggression and, if necessary, to combat it.

Mr. JAVITS. We feel that we want exactly the same objective served, and we feel we are serving it by opening these contracts more to competitive activity than to negotiation. That is precisely our point. We feel that whether it is by reason of inertia or the fact that the military authorities are in a physical and business sense closer to the people in California, this activity has become weighted altogether the other way.

I say to my colleague from California and the people of California that before I come here with proposed legislation—and I know this is as true of my colleague as of myself—we meet with manufacturers and representatives of trade unions in our respective States, and say to them, "You will have to sharpen your pencil. This will not happen because we have influence, or you wish it. You must earn it, based upon the job you can do."

That is the kind of opportunity we seek for our people in New York.

I wish to discuss other subjects, but for the moment I ask unanimous consent to yield to my colleague from New York with respect to the same subject we were discussing, with the reservation that I shall not lose my right to the floor, and may reclaim the floor after he has made his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORE DEFENSE CONTRACTS FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy to join as a cosponsor in the legislation introduced and discussed by my distinguished colleague, and I believe it is in the national interest. I share his view that there is no effort or desire on the part of the representatives of the State of New York in either body to get anything to which we are not justly entitled. There is no claim made that contracts for defense should be let on a strictly geographical basis or anything of the kind, but certainly it is desirable in the national interest to have a greater amount of both competitive bidding and competitive negotiations than we have enjoyed in the past.

There is another facet of the problem which I want to discuss today. I refer to an objection raised to plans to increase business in depressed areas. It was voiced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I find his objection totally lacking in merit. It must be conceded at this moment that there is no one in the Senate more alert to the interests of his own State than is our distinguished colleague, the Senator from California. He has made the point that it is illegal for the President to encourage the granting of more contracts to depressed or labor surplus areas. I disagree emphatically with such interpretation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be happy to yield either now or later.

Mr. KUCHEL. I would prefer to have the Senator yield now for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield now.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it the contention of the able junior Senator from New York that the laws of the United States permit any or all of the expenditures by this Congress for national defense to be used for the purpose of relieving unemployment in this land?

Mr. KEATING. No; the Senator from New York makes no such contention, but the present laws of the United States give to the President of the United States the right to consider labor surplus areas in the award of contracts to small businesses. In order to put an end to the controversy, because there is nothing that is more abhorrent to me than a controversy with my dear friend from California——

Mr. KUCHEL. I am bleeding inwardly.

Mr. KEATING. I am bleeding outwardly. But, in order to end this controversy, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1961 in order to put the defense procurement set-aside program for depressed areas on the same legal footing as the set-aside for small business. I intend to urge a similar amendment to the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1962. I am introducing this measure now. I realize it is unusual to introduce an amendment to an appropriation act. I introduce it in order that it may be printed and may be under review before the Defense appropriation hearings begin. I am joined in this effort by my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The entire field of defense procurement is a difficult one. That is conceded. But, with the Defense Department budget of $40 billion, it certainly is an area vitally important to the economy of the whole country.

Furthermore, as President Eisenhower warned in his farewell address:

> This conjunction of an immense Military Establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience * * * we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

It is not enough to let procurement processes proceed from administrative action alone. Last year I was a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to increase the opportunities for competitive negotiation in the Department of Defense.

Last year, as has been pointed out, all of the members of the New York delegation introduced a similar bill, and we are reintroducing it this year. I strongly support this bill, and hope that it will be acted upon by the Congress.

The bill I am offering today goes a step further, but in the same general direction. Some of the provisions of the proposed legislation which we offered last year have now been incorporated in administrative rulings, and therefore are now in effect.

I believe that the introduction of the proposed legislation last year focused the attention of the Defense Department on this problem. We must continue our studies of Defense Department procurement, to ascertain how the interest, not only of depressed areas, but also, indeed, of the whole economy and national security can be further strengthened.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill which is introduced today by me and my senior colleague [Mr. JAVITS] be printed in the RECORD, followed by an analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the text of the bill and the analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1961 (Public Law 86-601, approved July 7, 1960) is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 535 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 536. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall assist business enterprises engaged in business within areas of labor surplus in the United States to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated under this Act by (1) making available or causing to be made available to enterprises in labor surplus areas information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds appropriated under this Act, (2) making available or causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting agencies of the Department of Defense information as to commodities and services produced and furnished by enterprises in labor surplus areas, and (3) otherwise helping to give enterprises in labor surplus areas an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated by this Act."

(b) That title is further amended by redesignating section 536 thereof (as originally enacted) as section 537 thereof.

BILL ANALYSIS

Let me make it clear exactly what my amendment would do and what it would not do. First, it would not mean that the U.S. Government—and that means the taxpayer—would pay any higher price for the goods purchased. Secondly, I think I should point out that, already, under existing administrative regulations areas of labor surplus do get some attention and preference in the awarding of certain contracts where this is economically feasible. This is right and proper.

What my amendment would do is to put this preference on the same basis as the small business preference, by putting it in the Appropriation Act rather than leaving it entirely up to administrative determination. It would eliminate the—I must say—rather farfetched and forced doubts that may exist as to the legality of the President's directive. And it would make clear beyond doubt the importance which the Congress attaches to measures for increasing business opportunities within areas of labor surplus.

It is evident from the figures available that the impact of the depressed area set-aside for defense procurement to date has been rather small. Furthermore it has been decreasing rather than increasing. In fiscal 1957, less than five-tenths of 1 percent of Department of Defense procurement dollars were negotiated through the depressed area set-aside program; in 1958, two-tenths of 1 percent; in 1959, five-tenths of 1 percent; and in 1960 only two-tenths of 1 percent. For the first quarter of fiscal 1962, the figure fell to one-tenth of 1 percent. Part of the 1960 decline, of course, was the result of fewer areas being designated as areas of labor surplus. And I realize that these figures by no means cover all the contracts that go to depressed areas, through nonpreferential action or through tie-bid determinations. But they do show that the depressed area set-aside has so far not been implemented on a very large scale by the administering authorities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced with respect to Defense Department procurement be made a part of my remarks.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Armed Services Competitive Procurement Act of 1961".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The text of section 2301 of chapter 137 of title 10 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(a) It is the policy of the Congress that agencies making procurements under this

chapter shall use methods of procurement which will, in conformity with the Nation's private economic system, assure maximum competition consistent with the national security, the needs of the agency, and the character of the products and services being procured. Accordingly, it is the further policy of the Congress that, where the national interest requires that formal advertising and competitive bidding be replaced by negotiation, such negotiation incorporate procedures of competitive negotiation to the greatest extent practicable, consistent with the national security, the needs of the agency, and the character of the products and services being procured.

"(b) It is the further policy of the Congress that the agencies shall purchase products and services which will most economically and efficiently satisfy the needs of such agencies, including, to the maximum extent practicable, products which are readily available on the open market where the purchase of such product is consistent with the requirements and the standardization programs of the agencies.

"(c) The Congress declares that the security of the Nation requires that its economy, and the economy of each section of the country, be maintained at a level which can support its programs for defense and sustain the private economic system, and that procurements by agencies under this chapter have a meaningful effect upon the Nation's economic health. Accordingly, it is the further policy of the Congress that, insofar as is consistent with the national security, the needs of the agency, and the character of the products and services being procured—

"(i) a fair proportion of purchases made under this chapter be placed with small business concerns;

"(ii) a fair proportion of purchases made under this chapter be placed with concerns located in areas of substantial labor surplus; and

"(iii) in placing purchases under this chapter the procuring agency shall consider the strategic and economic desirability of allocating purchases to different geographic areas of the Nation and to eligible suppliers from whom relatively smaller proportions of procurement have been purchased."

COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 3. That portion of section 2304(a) of chapter 137 of such title which precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Purchases of and contracts for property or services covered by this chapter shall be made by formal advertising. However, the head of an agency may negotiate such a purchase or contract, subject to the policy declared in section 2301(a) of this title requiring competitive negotiation, if—".

FORMAL ADVERTISING; COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION; SPECIFICATIONS

SEC. 4. Section 2305 of chapter 137 of such title is amended as follows:

(a) Section 2305(a) is redesignated section 2305(a)(1) and is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) Whenever formal advertising is required under section 2304 of this title, the advertisement shall be made a sufficient time before the purchase or contract. The specifications and invitations for bids shall permit such free and full competition as is consistent with the procurement of the property and services needed by the agency concerned: *Provided*, That invitations to bid in any purchase to be made by formal advertising may be restricted to qualified small business concerns or concerns in a specified area of the Nation, unless the head of the agency determines that such restriction would not be consistent with the national interest."

(b) Section 2305(b) is repealed.

(c) Section 2305(c) is redesignated section 2305(a)(2).

(d) Immediately after section 2305(a)(2) the following is added:

"(b) COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION—

"(1) Whenever competitive negotiation is required under section 2304 of this title, the solicitation of proposals shall be made from two or more sources in sufficient time before the purchase or contract. The specifications and requests for proposals shall permit such competition as is consistent with the procurement of the property and services needed by the agency concerned.

"(2) After receipt and review of proposals, negotiations shall be conducted with all responsible suppliers who have submitted proposals within a reasonable competitive range, price and other factors considered. If such negotiations indicate that the request for proposals was so misleading or unclear as to cause widespread difference of interpretation, all offerors shall be afforded equal opportunity to revise their proposals.

"(3) Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that offeror whose proposal will be most advantageous to the United States as determined by the head of the agency. However, all proposals may be rejected if the head of the agency determines that rejection is in the public interest. In the event award is made to other than the offeror offering the lowest price, an explanation of the basis for the award shall be furnished to each lower offeror upon request, and a written justification for such award shall be made a part of the contract file."

(e) Section 2305(d) is redesignated section 2305(c) and is further amended to read as follows:

"(c) If the head of the agency considers that any bid received after formal advertising or any proposal received during competitive negotiation evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer such bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action."

(f) Immediately after section 2305(c) as redesignated by this section, the following is added:

"(d) Formal advertising and competitive negotiation shall be conducted in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(e) In all procurements under this title, property to be procured shall be identified in specifications in the simplest manner consistent with the needs of the procuring agency, the nature of the property to be procured and the requirements of the defense cataloging and standardization programs established in accordance with chapter 145 of this title. In conformance with the above, procurement specifications shall wherever practicable express the characteristics of the property in terms of performance rather than in terms of design and manufacturing details."

MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 2302 of chapter 137 of such title is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(3) 'Formal advertising' means advertising as prescribed by section 2305(a) of this title."

(2) Immediately after clause (3) of such section the following is added:

"(4) 'Competitive negotiation' means negotiation as prescribed by section 2305(b) of this title."

(b) The catchline of section 2304 of such chapter is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2304. Purchases and contracts: formal advertising; competitive negotiation; exceptions."

(c) Section 2305 of such chapter is amended as follows:

(1) The catchline to such section is amended to read—

"§ 2305. Formal advertising; competitive negotiation; specifications."

(2) Immediately after the catchline, the following is added:

"(a) FORMAL ADVERTISING.—".

(d) Section 2306(b) of such chapter is amended by inserting after "negotiated" where it appears therein "with or without competition".

(e) Section 2307(a) of such chapter is amended by striking out "negotiated contract," where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "contract negotiated with or without competition,".

(f) Section 2313(b) of such chapter is amended by inserting after "negotiated" where it appears therein "with or without competition".

(g) Section 2356(b) of chapter 139 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to other provisions of law, the power to negotiate, with or without competition, and administer contracts for research and development, or both, may be further delegated."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I now yield to two of my colleagues in the Senate, but I ask that they be fairly brief, and limit their remarks to not more than 5 minutes each, because I have a television appointment to keep this afternoon. I now first yield to the distinguished majority leader, and in yielding I make the same unanimous-consent request that I made with respect to my colleague [Mr. KEATING]; then I make the same request with respect to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, certain nominations have been reported to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The Secretary will report the first nomination.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF J. ALLEN FREAR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Allen Frear, of Delaware, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to endorse wholeheartedly the nomination of my former colleague, Senator J. Allen Frear, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I endorse his nomination, and I recommend its confirmation for the following reasons:

First, on the basis of his outstanding ability to fulfill the duties of this important position.

Second, I endorse confirmation of his nomination on the basis of his having a host of friends in our State.

Last of all, but by far not the least important, I endorse confirmation of the nomination of Senator Frear as a very close friend. I join his host of friends both in Delaware and in the U.S. Senate in expressing gratification that the outstanding ability and the high integrity of Senator Frear have been recognized by the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action taken on the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF WASTE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today I present to the Senate further evidence of mismanagement in the Department of Defense, resulting in further waste of large amounts of the taxpayer's money.

Two reports I have with me here today have to do with the procurement of two types of aircraft, one type of radar equipment for aircraft, and mismanagement of the flow of aircraft engines to the maintenance pipeline.

In the instances of procurement of aircraft and equipment, the Navy proceeded with production, despite knowledge that the products in question would not meet those performance specifications which the service itself had laid down.

As a result, over $600 million was expended for aircraft and equipment which was incapable of performing the designated missions.

These unwarranted expenditures are broken down in these reports as follows: Procurement of F–7–U aircraft, $417.2 million; procurement of T–2–V aircraft, $139 million; procurement of radar for P–5–M aircraft, $51.6 million; procurement of excess engines, $68 million.

Now to some of the details: 549 of the F–7–U—twin engine jet all-weather fighter—were ordered; 304 of these planes were produced.

Faulty characteristics in prototype were never overcome—therefore, 245 planes were finally canceled.

On those which were built, however, the accident rate was more than twice that of any other jet fighter, resulting in the loss of 34 planes.

The period of average use of this aircraft was first reduced to 22 months. Finally all of them were withdrawn from flight operations; and a few months later all of them were withdrawn from reserve status. Soon thereafter they were all declared excess.

In connection with the T–2–V single engine trainer, 389 were ordered, 149 produced, and the remaining 240 canceled because the performance of the plane was found inadequate for the mission assigned.

Volume production of the radar for the P–5–M—an antisubmarine propeller powered aircraft—weapons system—APS–44–A search radar—was ordered before delivery of the first development model; and additional orders were placed even after evidence of unreliability had accumulated.

The Navy finally decided on replacement, but not until 263 useless sets had been produced at a unit cost of about $200,000.

The second report I have with me today concerns waste resulting from mismanagement in the flow of aircraft engines to the overhaul pipelines—from time to time aircraft engines must be withdrawn for reservicing.

Since the number of engines needed increases with the length of time each engine spends in overhaul, excess out-of-service time automatically increases cost.

Examination by the General Accounting Office showed that, whereas Air Force records revealed a reconditioning time of 150 days was adequate, Navy engines averaged 275 days per engine.

In this case, the report estimates an excess of engine procurement of $68 million—waste attributed to unwarranted time spent in the overhaul pipeline.

At the time this $68 million excess was discovered, plans called for the procurement of 204 more of the same engines—cost $33 million.

This report had selected for review seven aircraft engine models classed as being in critical short supply—and it was in these very models that this heavy overprocurement was discovered.

The unit cost of the engines in question was $250,000.

Obviously such a policy was rewarding to the engine manufacturer; but not to the taxpayer.

Once again we have reports which illustrate the degree of appreciation the Congress and the citizen should have for the quiet but thorough diligence of the General Accounting Office.

Let me again present to my colleagues that this waste in the management of our defenses should not be blamed entirely on the services.

Under the present antique organization structure of the Pentagon, for which the Congress itself shares a grave responsibility, authority, and responsibility are often found so far apart that each service is in a competitive race with various other branches of the Government to obtain material and skills to the point where relatively little attention is paid to efficiency and cost.

We all know that the present obsolete defense organization does not adequately recognize the great changes in defense concept brought on by the nuclear space age.

Unless this organization is modernized, we will have the same type of waste in the future that these reports reveal as characteristic of the past.

Earlier this week I referred to waste in the Army. In the next few days I shall discuss waste in the Air Force.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLUMBIA BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have recently received an editorial carried in the February 27 edition of the Grant County Daily Journal which deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It was written by Mr. Ronald Sisson, managing editor of the newspaper. He

has phrased so well the problems confronting our Columbia Basin development program at this time that I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WE NEED A NEW START IN SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

(By Ron Sisson)

The Columbia Basin reclamation project has entered an all-out battle that will climax with the survival of the fittest.

With the announcement of President John F. Kennedy's vast natural resources program, there will be a parade of proponents asking Federal expenditures for development of the Nation's lifeblood supplies of water, land, forest and mineral projects. Competition will be downright tough.

All citizens of the Columbia Basin must join together in trumpeting the suitability and adequacy of the project to fit into this development program.

Under present Bureau of Reclamation programing of funds now budgeted for construction and projected congressional monetary grants, basin construction will carry on at a very modest pace until advancement is mothballed in 1966. The once projected 1-million-acre development will stop short at 481,495 acres—a job half done.

Let's first consider President Kennedy's own words in announcing his new program:

"By the year 2000, a U.S. population of 300 million—nearly doubled in 40 years—will need far greater supplies of farm products, timber, water, minerals, fuels, energy, and opportunity for outdoor recreation."

Look at that: "* * * farm products, water, energy, opportunity for outdoor recreation"—this is the Columbia Basin.

Add flood control, favorable climate, farm jobs for youth, and market accessibility to the basin assets.

Who is going to tell President Kennedy, Congress, and the Department of Interior that the Columbia Basin project must be completed to the million-acre goal? Who is going to assert that the basin is an integral vein in the future lifeblood of the Nation?

You and only you—all citizens of the basin—can do the job well.

No individual or divided group effort will be victorious against the hundreds of strong advocates for new starts in natural resources projects.

We must convince Congress that a new start is needed in the now lagging basin construction. We must say positively that the completion of the project is wanted by all.

Some persons would take the negative approach in a plea for additional basin funds. Indeed, loss of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation payroll will hit us in the pocketbook. It will sap strength from our entire economic system, business, schools, churches, civic organizations, tax rolls; loss of Federal jobs will mean loss of related jobs.

But, the positive approach must be taken.

Tell the authorities we have a time-tested product to offer. The basin investment is more than paying its own way with interest. It's not a political grab bag, but rather a sound, profitable security.

Tell them that the land is doing its part in producing prosperous high-yield crops. Send a copy of the 1960 basin crop return report. It's a convincing argument. Tell them we have 500,000 more thirsty acres ready to feed that double population in the year 2000 if irrigation water is sent to quench the thirst.

Convince them that food and energy are as much a part of national defense as multi-million-dollar weapons. This food and energy will never become obsolete. They will be needed in 2000. Let us pray the weapons will be vague remembrances of the past in 2000.

Tell them we have Grand Coulee Dam ready to add a third powerhouse. Tell them we have experienced personnel. Tell them we have a vast network of preliminary canal studies not wanting to be wasted for lack of funds to continue. Tell them we have the East Low Canal, Potholes Canal, and Wahluke Canal wanting to serve thousands more acres.

Remind them that we are in the wake of the western population explosion. Who will be here first: the people or the food supply? Also remind them that our time-tested climate gives out warmth for recreation along with its greeting to agriculture.

Don't forget to remind them that Columbia Basin sugar crop yields are increasing. Friend or foe, Cuba will no longer force itself to supply the Western World with sugar, once it has discovered it can feed its own hungry people with other crops grown on plantation lands.

Tell them we're not quitters. We don't want to settle for a job half done.

Tell them they've got a good thing started. Let's keep it moving.

The basin will survive. It's the fittest.

ANNOUNCED WITHDRAWAL FROM INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING TRADE OF THE LUCKENBACH STEAMSHIP CO.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senate's attention to an editorial in last Friday's New York Journal of Commerce regarding the announced withdrawal from the intercoastal shipping trade of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., after 110 years of operation in this field.

That this withdrawal will result, at least temporarily, in leaving the west coast without any steamship service to the Atlantic and gulf ports of our country, is lamentable. Even more distressing, however, is the fact that, as our committee developed in hearings last year, one of the primary reasons for this and other withdrawals from the coastal and intercoastal services in recent years has been the failure of responsible Government regulatory agencies to discharge their functions with due regard for the steamship companies' rights under the national transportation policy.

This latest, thoroughly regrettable loss to the Nation's oceanborne shipping facilities will, I sincerely hope, impress upon both the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal maritime authorities that the public interest has suffered greatly because of lack of protective action to safeguard these vulnerable sectors of our transportation system. I hope the two agencies will be inspired thereby to reexamine and reorient their thinking in this area, to the point first, that further depletion of the remaining coastal lines be prevented, if at all possible; second, that present and any additional future coastal and intercoastal steamship services be protected against predatory rate cutting such as has been largely responsible for their troubles in the past; and, third, that positive policies and, if necessary, new legislative proposals be developed, looking toward the reestablishment and nurturing of a coastal-intercoastal shipping system that will supplement our continental surface transportation system and will give the shipping interests on all coasts of the United States the low-cost benefits inherent in ocean transportation.

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

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

SHIPPING OUTLOOK: LUCKENBACH MOVE POSES BIG PROBLEM FOR U.S. REGULATORS

(By Stanley Mantrop)

The decision by Luckenbach Steamship Co. to end its 100 years of intercoastal service is just another example of what American-flag shipping is up against today in its fight for survival.

We have no argument with Luckenbach's decision to retire from the once flourishing trade. After all, a shipping line, and an unsubsidized one at that, cannot go on losing money indefinitely. In providing a service on the intercoastal routes, Luckenbach's operations went deep into the red and quite rightfully the management took steps to curb the financial drain by seeking cargoes in other trades.

Such a situation is not confined to Luckenbach. There are strong reports that another coastwise carrier will follow suit in a few days for almost the same reasons as the withdrawal of Luckenbach ships.

Unquestionably much of the responsibility for the near demise of the intercoastal shipping trade must fall on the shoulders of the several Government agencies which have failed to take a firm stand on how best to keep the services alive while still providing sufficient incentive for the railroads and other carriers to exist in the same service areas.

The decision by Luckenbach to move out of the intercoastal service was prompted by the Federal Maritime Board's failure to meet Luckenbach's target date on mortgage insurance on five containerships which the company had planned to build for trade. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. is also seeking Federal aid to build containerships for the intercoastal trade.

It is unfortunate that mortgage insurance aid could not go to both of these excellent ship lines because it had been apparent for some time that one would have to go if Federal aid went to the other.

Fortunately, the subsidized lines in the offshore trade with which Luckenbach has now decided to cast its lot are not faced with the same financial problems as far as Government aid is concerned. But on the other hand most of them are facing difficult times due to heavy competition, from lack of cargoes and a lack of adequate ships to do the job alongside their foreign competitors.

The new administration has given some encouragement to the shipping industry in that it has accepted the plea that American-flag shipping is going to be in hot water unless it gets more financial aid.

In order to keep American-flag shipping alive let us have a whole review of the subsidy situation and an examination of trade routes in order to find out just where some new life can be pumped into the industry.

Certainly something can be done by the Federal agencies concerned to find ways and means of resolving the intercoastal shipping situation. The shipping industry has shown its confidence in the trade by its willingness to invest millions in building new ships for the trade. There must be some way of funneling this confidence into the right Government channels so that something concrete can be done to keep intercoastal shipping from sinking into the depths.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of an amendment, which I now offer and send to the desk, before action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, after "Illinois", it is proposed to insert the following:

One additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana,

On page 6, in the table, it is proposed to strike out the asterisks between the matter relating to Illinois and the matter relating to Iowa and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Indiana:	
Northern	3
Southern	3

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendment will provide two additional judges for Indiana, one for the northern district and one for the southern district.

For the benefit of my distinguished friends on the minority side, I have discussed this with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the chairman of the committee, and they have all agreed this procedure could be followed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT STUDY OF CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN, N.C.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that I address the Senate today. I wish to speak about a joint study of the Cape Fear River Basin in North Carolina which is being conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.

My feelings are mixed, because I had hoped that it would not be necessary for me to take up this matter on the floor of the Senate until the study had been completed.

My remarks today constitute a report on the progress of this study, the delays it has encountered, and the seriousness of the differences of views between the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service regarding it.

In no way do I intend my remarks to be critical of any officials of the Corps of Engineers or the Soil Conservation Service.

Honest differences of opinion exist which involve the future policy of the Federal Government regarding the development of our water resources. These differences need to be known. The facts need to be brought out, and they speak for themselves.

What has happened in the case of the Cape Fear River Basin survey is an example of needlessly prolonged indecision when two agencies of the Federal Government do not find common areas of agreement.

I am certain that the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service are both sincere and responsible in the views they hold concerning the development of the Cape Fear River Basin. But sincere and responsible as they are, it becomes a matter of governmental irresponsibility when inaction is the only reaction to the urgent water needs of not only North Carolina but also the entire Nation.

The development of the water resources of the Cape Fear River Basin and the controlling of floods in this basin have for many years held the deep interest of the people of North Carolina.

This basin is the largest river basin in North Carolina. It covers an area of over 8,500 square miles, and one-third of our State's population lives in the Cape Fear Basin.

For the past 50 years, this area of North Carolina has been hampered greatly by floods and threats of floods in rainy seasons. In dry seasons, many cities and towns in the basin have been forced to ration water.

Because this great river has never been harnessed, a large portion of North Carolina has been denied economic growth, development, and expansion to an immeasurable degree.

Since as early as 1927 there have been sporadic efforts to find a practical plan for effective flood control and utilization of the water resources in the Cape Fear Basin.

In 1945 a disastrous flood occurred on the Cape Fear and, as a result of this flood, which caused nearly $5 million in damages, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives caused the Corps of Engineers to start a review of earlier surveys of the river basin. A public hearing was held by the Corps of Engineers in 1946 and most of the technical fieldwork was completed shortly thereafter. But a final economic analysis was never made and no determination was made about the types of structures that should be used to harness the river.

As the years passed, work on the study all but came to a halt until the late Senator W. Kerr Scott obtained funds in 1955 to revive it.

Senator Scott held the view—and I think it was a valid one—that no possible alternate plan for the development of the river basin should be overlooked.

Pursuing this approach, Senator Scott called a meeting of officials of the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and others in his office on June 12, 1957.

At this meeting, it was agreed that the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service would carry out a joint study of the Cape Fear River Basin.

In many ways this was a unique approach. It was a pioneering move to bring together for a joint effort the two agencies of the Federal Government most directly involved with flood control and water resources problems. As preliminary plans for the study advanced, it was decided that the State of North Carolina would also provide assistance to the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.

A joint conference of these agencies was held in July 1957, and subsequently a series of several meetings was held by special work groups which were set up.

When I became a Member of the Senate in 1958, I asked for a report on the work being carried on and I was pleased with the progress that was being made at that time.

I was advised in 1959 that adequate funds were available to the agenices involved to carry the joint study to a completion in fiscal year 1959.

I had hoped that a report would be forthcoming soon, certainly not later than the fall of 1959. But weeks and months passed, and no report was made.

On January 16, 1960, I wrote an identical letter to Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief, Corps of Engineers, and the Honorable Donald A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, in which I urged the early completion of the report in view of the fact that all of the fieldwork had long since been completed.

The text of that letter is as follows:

As you know, the Army Engineers have been engaged in studying the Cape Fear River and its tributaries for more than 30 years. With renewed emphasis beginning in 1956, and since 1957 the Engineers have carried on a joint study with the Soil Conservation Service, with the objective of determining the best method of controlling floods and developing the water resources of this populous basin where one-third of North Carolina's 4½ million people live and work.

I have been advised a number of times last year and the year before that a report on the results of the joint study could be expected within a relatively short time.

I understand that a vast amount of work has been done by the field staffs of both the Engineers and the SCS, and that their studies of the problem have long since been completed.

I have reason to believe that this report could have been made last year, and I am satisfied that it was not made due to indecision and dissension on the part of both the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers at the policy level in Washington.

I am sure that you are aware of the importance of the development of the Cape Fear River basin to the future growth of North Carolina, and I want you to know that I feel very strongly that its importance far outweighs the apparent bickering that is causing the delay in the submission of the report.

I strongly urge you to take whatever steps are necessary to expedite forthwith the completion and submission to the Congress the report on the Cape Fear River basin. In view of the fact that the field work was completed long ago, I am sure you will agree that this is a reasonable request. This is particularly true since the

delay in finalizing the Cape Fear report is also causing costly and undue delays in urgently needed work on the Neuse River basin survey.

Late in the month of May I received similar letters from the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service in response to my letters, and both letters stated that the report was scheduled to be completed in the summer of 1960.

Today is March 2, 1961, and there has been no report forthcoming.

I have this day sent the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service the following letter, again requesting them to complete their report and transmit it to the Congress:

I am enclosing for your information a speech I made in the Senate Chamber today regarding the joint survey of the Cape Fear River basin being conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.

As you will recall, you informed me in May 1960, that work on the report of this survey was nearing completion and that it was then scheduled for completion in the summer of 1960.

I would like to urge you once again to take the necessary steps to insure that the joint report is completed and submitted to the Congress just as soon as possible.

These are the facts.

Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that after over 4 years of consultations, conferences, and working together, there still is no joint report from the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service relative to the Cape Fear River basin.

To say the least, both agencies must stand accountable for inaction and indecision at a time when there is urgent need for positive and constructive work in developing our water resources.

It is regrettable for everyone concerned—and by this I mean a third of the population of North Carolina—if dissension and conflicting views are the cause for the delay in filing the report. In all fairness, I can understand why the two agencies may not agree entirely on the best approaches to use, but I cannot understand why they have not—long before now at least—agreed to disagree.

The time has come when those in authority must make a decision to end indecision.

YOUTH PEACE CORPS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in all the discussion of the Peace Corps set up Wednesday by Executive order of the President, one point seems to have been largely overlooked—the strange method in which it was created.

President Kennedy had indicated he would ask Congress to establish such an agency, and legislation is now pending in both Houses. But instead of following this normal procedure, the President has bypassed Congress, and set up the program by Executive order.

Admittedly, this simplifies matters greatly. It eliminates the nuisance of explaining to congressional committees exactly how the program would work. If there are any pitfalls in the plan, they can remain conveniently hidden. If the State Department or foreign governments have misgivings or suggestions, they need not be aired publicly.

And the clinching argument is that Congress would probably approve the plan, anyway. So why bother with the formalities?

This last argument reminds one of Castro's explanations of why he has not bothered to hold elections—the people undoubtedly would elect him anyway, so why bother?

No matter how excellent the Peace Corps idea may be, there is no reason for setting it up in this manner, which evidences such disdain for the constitutional division of powers. This is no emergency program which must be set up this week—and if it were, the President could probably get immediate congressional action if he wanted it.

The President's action indicates an impatience with the procedures we know as due process of law, and is an example of the alarming degree to which Congress has permitted its functions to be taken over by the Executive. This procedure might be difficult to explain to a high school civics student, who naively believes that the Nation's laws are established by Congress.

ONE-HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF MRS. HELEN BATCHELDER

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, ordinarily I would not consider it justifiable to take the time of the Senate to call attention to a matter of purely sentimental importance and not involving a person of national fame.

However, I cannot refrain at this time from taking the liberty of inviting the attention of the Senate to the fact that a lady in my State of New Hampshire will be 100 years old on the day after tomorrow, March 4. That means that she was born on the day that Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated as President of the United States in front of our Capitol.

Mrs. Helen Batchelder, of Hampton Falls, N.H., has been the town librarian for 40 years. She will celebrate her 100th birthday anniversary by performing her duties, as usual, in the town library. She resides in the village which is the home of the Governor of New Hampshire, His Excellency Wesley Powell, who will be present to congratulate her, as will also other friends in the community.

I have taken the liberty of calling the White House, to request that, if it is at all possible, she might receive greetings from the President of the United States. If any Member of the Senate or anyone connected with the Senate feels that it might be a worthwhile gesture, under these extraordinary circumstances, to send Mrs. Batchelder his greetings, I know that she would welcome them, and it would be appreciated, also, by Senator BRIDGES and me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article about Mrs. Batchelder published in the Hampton Union.

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

FALLS LIBRARIAN WILL BE FETED ON 100TH BIRTHDAY

HAMPTON FALLS.—Mrs. Helen Batchelder is going to celebrate her 100th birthday on the job.

Librarian of the Hampton Falls Public Library for 40 years, she will be 100 years old March 4, and the town is expected to turn out for the library open house being planned in her honor that afternoon from 2 to 5.

While no special program is scheduled, there will be tea for visitors. Gov. Wesley Powell, a neighbor, plans to drop in about 4:30 to pay his respects.

Mrs. Batchelder has been chaplain of Hampton Falls Grange for 51 years and is the only living charter member.

Mrs. Thayer Edgerly, who has been assistant librarian for some years, keeps the library open Tuesday evenings and Wednesday afternoons, but Mrs. Batchelder—unless the weather is against it—still presides at her books Saturday afternoons.

Though there are other claimants to the oldest title, the local library is credited in the town history with being the first free public library in America. It has been located in a 125-year-old former church building since 1901.

Mrs. Batchelder makes her home here across the road from the library with her daughter, Miss Martha Batchelder. She has a son, Windsor, now retired and living in Connecticut, and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren, most of whom plan to be here for the anniversary.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for myself and my colleague [Mr. ENGLE] I offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) The first paragraph of section 84 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"California is divided into three judicial districts, to be known as the northern, central, and southern districts of California."

(b) Section 84 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CENTRAL DISTRICT

"(b) The central district comprises two divisions.

"(1) The northern division comprises the counties of Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Madera, except Yosemite National Park, Mariposa, except Yosemite National Park, Merced, and Tulare.

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Fresno.

"(2) The southern division comprises the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

"Court for the southern division shall be held at Los Angeles.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(c) The southern district comprises the counties of Imperial and San Diego.

"Court for the southern district shall be held at San Diego."

(c) The two district judges for the southern district of California holding office immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act and whose official station on such date is San Diego shall, on and after such date be the district judges for the southern district of California and all other district judges for the southern district of California holding office immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act shall, on and after such date, be district judges for the central district of California.

(d) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, and two additional district judges for the central district of California.

(e) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of judicial districts and district judgeships for the State of California, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said State:

"Districts	*Judges*
California:	
Northern	9
Central	11
Southern	2"

On page 2, in the committee amendment, beginning with line 9, strike out down through the word "California", in line 12.

On page 5, in the table following line 15, strike out the matter relating to California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the amendment which my colleague and I offer does not add any additional judgeships to the pending bill. However, it creates a new judicial district, composed of the counties of San Diego and Imperial, which lie at the southern end of California, along the border of the Republic of Mexico.

The amendment bears the endorsement of the State Bar Association of California; the California Legislature, by unanimous vote; the Governor of California; and the attorney general of California; as well as the endorsement of many other civic organizations.

The American Bar Association has recognized the public service rendered by the San Diego County Bar Association in proposing the legislation by an award of merit granted last year, in 1960.

What are the reasons for such widespread support of the new district of California?

California has but two districts, as compared with four each for New York and Texas and three each for Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. Yet California is now the second State in population and in size is exceeded only by Alaska and Texas. California districts were provided many years ago when the State was very gravely belittled. In the past decade its growth has been explosive. Population growth has been recognized as a reason for providing a much needed third district for Florida in the omnibus judgeship bill. Yet California is much larger than Florida in population and size.

The district provided by the amendment comprises the counties of San Diego and Imperial. San Diego County has had the greatest percentage population increase, 86 percent, of any metropolitan area in the country from 1950 to 1960 except Phoenix, Ariz. It grew from 556,808 to 1,033,011. With Imperial County the new district will have a population of 1,103,627. The county of San Diego is now the second largest in the State, and the city of San Diego is now the third largest on the Pacific coast, being right behind San Francisco and ahead of Seattle. The new district in area will be about twice the size of Connecticut.

But it is not size and rapid growth alone that require the establishment of the new district but the need to provide better law enforcement and the better administration of both civil and criminal cases.

San Diego and Imperial Counties comprise the California border with Mexico. Smuggling, narcotics, and subversion problems are extremely serious. The 25th customs district, which comprises exactly the same boundaries as the new district, has a larger number of narcotic arrests and seizures than any other district. They rose from 68 in 1952 to 306 in 1959. Border crossings at San Diego rose from 6,787,148 in 1950 to 18,331,773 in 1960.

In addition, San Diego comprises a vast naval and marine complex, probably the greatest in the world. This generates a great number of Federal civil and criminal cases as does the great and growing port of San Diego which increased its business even in the slow year of 1960. And the vast defense industries with patent and other Federal questions.

It is not then surprising that the San Diego Federal courts have probably the highest criminal load per population in the country. Figures and statements submitted to the Judiciary Committee by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and by the San Diego County Bar Association all show this, even when allowances are made for a large number of routine immigration cases.

Although the proposed new central district—Los Angeles and surrounding counties, now the central division—has almost eight times the population of the two southern counties, their criminal case filings are about the same. In 1959 it was, central 952 and southern 887; and in 1960, 1,006 for the central and 855 for the southern divisions. In the southern division, the proposed new southern district, the cases actually coming to trial in 1960 increased 42 percent over 1959. This is so because of the stiff new narcotic sentences. Felons now insist on trials rather than pleading guilty.

Because of the seriousness of the border and port criminal situation, administration from Los Angeles, 125 miles away, has not proved satisfactory. A strong U.S. attorney reporting directly to the Attorney General who can serve the local and Federal law enforcement agencies and officials and cooperate with the Mexican officials is needed. Most of the Federal cases involve Customs and the FBI. Their regional headquarters are at San Diego and their regional boundaries are exactly the boundaries of the new district.

Despite the magnitude of the problem, the practice has been to assign young assistants from Los Angeles to the San Diego office. The pay is low and the turnover has been heavy. Great additional expense is involved in duplicate files, coordination, travel, mileage, and phone calls to the government, its law enforcement agencies and the public.

The situation is even more serious in the case of civil cases. The local assistant U.S. attorneys do not handle these because they are too busy with the criminal calendar. Therefore, these cases are tried in San Diego by Los Angeles assistant U.S. attorneys. The expense is even heavier here, and there is no local continuity. The civil cases involving the Government are mostly big protracted cases—military condemnation, water, and antitrust. United States against Fallbrook, for example, involves 6,000 water defendants and has been in trial since 1958. Judge Carter has spent 140 days in trial already and many more days will be required. There are a number of other big civil cases.

There is no sign that the growth of San Diego will slow. The ninth circuit in its request for six courtrooms in the new San Diego Federal building, now in the planning stages, has demonstrated this.

The new district will not be expensive. Already present in San Diego are the three courtrooms now required, complete bankruptcy and grand jury facilities and officials, as well as clerks, marshals, and one of the largest criminal probation offices in the country whose 4 officers now supervise an average of 340 probationers a month. The additional cost, estimated after careful survey of present personnel and salaries and the few increases in salary and personnel, is $46,750. More than this will be saved in doing away with duplicate files and supervisions, travel, per diem, mileage, and phone expense.

No additional judges have been requested. The provision in the bill giving the Los Angeles area two more judges will, as the proponents have represented to the committee, free the San Diego judges from having to handle cases in Los Angeles, which has admittedly overburdened the San Diego judge.

A great increase in efficiency and better control of law enforcement in this critical, growing, international border and defense area will result from the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I think that as time goes by, requests will be made by the

congressional delegation from the State of California for additional judicial districts in our State. But here is a proposal which has been considered favorably by the House of Representatives in past sessions; here is something which bears the official endorsement of the Bar Association of California, of the local bar associations, of the Governor of California, and of the chief law enforcement officer.

For all those reasons, I ask the Senate, particularly the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to consider the amendment favorably.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend and colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my senior colleague has very ably and comprehensively covered the basic reasons for the creation of the new judicial district in the San Diego area. I am certain that he mentioned the fact that on August 30, 1957, a bill authorizing a new Federal district unanimously passed the U.S. Senate. So this is not the first time this matter has been before this body or has received its approval, if it receives its approval today.

The proposal was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in 1958 and 1960. So, as a consequence, the amendment offered by my senior colleague has once been approved by the Senate and twice been approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary, in addition to the other recommendations which he has covered so carefully and in such detail in his statement in support of the amendment.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleague from California in sponsoring and supporting the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from California a question. Will he yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand, the amendment creates a third district.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. To be named the southern district of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. It does not create additional judgeships.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Except those provided in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, as the bill came from the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will accept the amendment. I think it is meritorious.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to the Senator for his comment.

Mr. President, I ask for the question on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] on the bill now before the Senate.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE ON LEGISLATION TO CREATE A SECOND JUDGESHIP FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Affirmative action by the Senate in creating additional Federal judges will have a salutary effect on our judicial system. The large backlog of pending cases will be eased, and the bench, bar, and public alike will be the beneficiaries of this long-needed legislation.

For more than 5 years, I have been waging a fight to have a second judgeship created in my State. Until a few years ago, Nevada was a one-judge State. Under Public Law 294 of the 83d Congress, a temporary district judgeship was authorized and filled. We then had a period when two able judges were serving the district, assuring adequate judgepower and efficient and expedient administration of justice. This situation was not of long duration, however, as the senior judge of the district of Nevada retired for reasons of health and, under terms of the law, Nevada reverted to a one-judge State.

On behalf of my colleague, Mr. CANNON, and myself I have this year introduced a bill to provide for the appointment of a permanent additional district judge for the district of Nevada.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, Nevada is a State of vast area and a great amount of one judge's time is consumed in traveling. Nevada's lone district judge has cited figures showing that current travel expenses of the judge, with the attendant clerks, marshals, and other court personnel, amount to approximately $17,000 a year. With only a slight additional amount, a full-time judge could be provided for this district.

I am pleased to note that this legislation has the approval of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the Judicial Conference of the United States, along with the personal endorsement of the chief judge of the Third Circuit.

A second judgeship for Nevada is fully justified in the light of need, efficiency and convenience.

The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 14, after the word "Connecticut", to strike out "two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida,".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I understood there were to be no further votes today. I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 3, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Hickman Price, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSION

Neal J. Hardy, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James J. Reynolds, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles Donahue, of Maine, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Robert T. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1966.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Allen, Robert M.
Arana, Thomas
Baggett, Arthur E., Jr.
Barcay, Stephen J., Jr.
Batchelder, Wendell W.
Bautts, Donald R.
Beary, Franklin D.
Belser, Robert D.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Borowsky, Melvin
Botimer, Allen R.
Bowman, Ercil R., Jr.
Boyden, Douglas G.
Bramlett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
Brown, James M.
Brown, Robert A.
Buck, Wayne O.
Burke, Erwin L.
Cahill, Lewis N.
Carlton, Carter E., Jr.
Chamberlain, Philip H.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Cloyd, David H.
Coates, John R.
Coletta, Domenic F.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Cooper, William C., Jr.
Cordier, Robert D.
Cowan, David E.
Crawford, Edward P.
Crenwelge, Wilbur E.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Curran, John P.
Cusack, William E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Daughtridge, Truman G.
Davis, Milton D.
Dean, Philip J.
deArrigoitia-Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Dempsey, William C.
Desjardins, Jay A.
Doyle, Fred W.
Ellis, Elgar P., Jr.
Emich, Charles H.
Escajeda, Richard M.
Field, Richard A.
Fosburg, Richard G.
Frazier, Robert W.
George, Frederick
Gilchrist, Don K.
Glass, James L.
Glenn, James E.
Glick, Herbert E.
Goldthorpe, George W.
Grello, Fred W.
Gross, James D.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Heath, John F.
Heising, Ralph A.
Hoofer, Wilford D.
Houston, Harry R.
Hughes, James L.
Hughes, Luman H., Jr.
Hux, Robert H.
Jeffrey, William L.
Jensen, Joseph E., Jr.
Johnson, Walter M.
Joly, Eugene M.
Kaufmann, Edwin D.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyu P.
Kern, Arthur S.
Kindell, John R.
King, Glendall L.
King, James C.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Larson, Dale L.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Lintner, Donald R.
Lista, William A.
Logan, Jerome A.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Lukens, Robert W., Jr.
Mading, Russell F.
Manhart, John D.
Maxwell, Thomas E.
Mazur, John H.
McCarthy, Thomas E.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
McNitzky, Adam A.
McRoberts, Jay W.
Miale, August, Jr.
Miller, Alan G.
Miller, Russell, Jr.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Moga, Gregg M., Jr.
Moore, Thomas P.
Mozley, Paul D.
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mullin, Robert L.
Novotny, Charles A.
Nyirjesy, Istvan
O'Connell, Joseph P.
Odland, Winston B.

Palmer, Hayden D., Jr.
Parker, Paul E.
Philbrick, Clement J., Jr.
Pleotis, Peter
Powell, Alton L., III
Rhodes, Alfred K.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Albert M.
Rogers, Carl W.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Salsitz, Richard B.
Sargent, Robert T.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Schumacher, Harold R.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Seig, Duane L.
Shilling, Charles U.
Shuptar, Daniel
Sill, William E., Jr.
Slead, Franklin B.
Sorenson, Robert I.
Spagnoli, Robert C.
Spence, John W.
Steagal, Robert W., Jr.
Stebbins, George G., Jr.
Stevens, John J.
Stitcher, Joseph E.
Stotka, Victor L.
Svihus, Richard H.
Teneyck, David R.
Thomas, Robert C.
Trone, James N.
Upton, Richard T.
VanOrden, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Visscher, Robert D.
Voshell, Thomas H., Jr.
Walker, Vern N.
Walker, William W. A.
Wallace, Calvin R., Jr.
Walton, Fred R.
Walton, Harry L.
Webb, Blair M.
Welch, Cecil C.
Wetzel, Richard A.
Wiggs, Alfred E., II.
Willcutts, Morton D., Jr.
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Wilson, John S.
Witchen, Jack M.
Wolfe, Franklin M.
Young, James M.
Yurick, Bernard S.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abraham, Donavon E.
Arcand, Albert A.
Baker, Clovis M.
Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Bohl, Stanley C.
Borbidge, George F.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyd, David T.
Brady, James A.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Burbank, Donald D.
Carmody, Barry S.
Carpenter, Norman E.
Chapman, Darrell S.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dunlevy, John H.
Edsall, Van T.
Emery, William T.
Fanelty, William C.
Frost, Shirley D.
Ghostley, Gary D.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gore, Austin F., Jr.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hammond, James E.
Harris, Emerson M.
Harvey, Robert R., Jr.
Hassenplug, John F.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Hergesheimer, Charles H.
Hill, Kenneth E.
Hurt, Richard O.
Hutchinson, Arthur E.
Jackson, George A.
James, Billy M.
Keefer, Frederick H.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
Kick, David L.
King, Gerald H.
Koller, Bertil R.
Lane, Henry L.
Leighty, Gary C.
Lennox, Grenes J.
Lewis, Frederick W.
Margason, Bernard L.
Maxwell, Thomas A.
McNally, Joseph J.
Mija, Theodore
Mitchell, Billy R.
Mitchell, William F.
Morgan, Donald G.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Nelson, George W.
Offerman, George S.
Pattermann, Frank G.
Peloquin, Ferdinand C.
Perritt, Paul
Pettijohn, Thomas P.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Ramey, James B., Jr.
Ratley, James R.
Reade, Lowell A.
Rice, Charles E.
Riley, James E.
Rixey, Charles W.
Ryan, William J.
Salsman, Thomas E.
Samuelson, Charles H.
Sherrell, David P.
Slemons, Earl G., Jr.
Smith, Herbert R.
Spears, Laurence
Stratton, Dene B.
Sullivan, John P.
Taylor, James A.
Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Walsh, John E.
Wasson, John A.
Weisskopf, William M.
White, George H.
Wirsing, John A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bevan, Leroy A.
Clayton, Walter "B", Jr.
Crawford, Jack V.
Davis, Joe A.
Dillard, Donald H.
Feagins, Walter B., Jr.
Flatley, Eugene T.
Fogarty, Daniel F.
Ford, Thaine E.
Frimenko, Michael
Fuller, William C.
Geary, Joseph F.
Hardage, Owen A., Jr.
Heaney, Harold V.
Hershberger, John R., Jr.
Holland, Harry W., Jr.
Howard, Marvin W.
Huffman, William W.
Ingebretson, Ervin D.
Jones, William L., Jr.
Keen, Homer E., Jr.
O'Brien, Robert P.
Perry, Johnie L.
Ramsey, Vernon J.
Richards, Sherman B.
Rittenhouse, James C.
Roberson, Ronald L.
Ryan, Joseph E.
Samuel, William R.
Smith, Richard R.
Smith, William G., Jr.
Stewart, Dell F., Jr.
Veltman, Dean K.
Wartes, Arthur J.
Wilson, Donald M.
Zeller, Dwight F.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Biederman, Richard J.
Bodtke, David H.
Boyce, Keith C.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Clerc, Louis H.
Courtright, Carl
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
DeGroot, Ward W., III
Martin, Robert A.
Middleton, William D., Jr.
Olson, Paul D.
Stevens, Warren G.
Zobel, William M.

DENTAL CORPS

Corderman, Roy C., Jr.
Cotton, William R.
Enoch, James D.
Evans, Charles G.
Falcone, Philip R.
Gaston, Robert A.
Hardin, Jefferson F.
Haymore, Robert D.
Hyde, Jack E.
Keene, Harris J.
Koutrakos, John
Lommel, Tennyson J.
Longton, Robert W.
Loo, Wallace D.
Luther, Norman K.
Muller, Henry, III
Prince, Richard D.
Rademacher, Gary E.
Raybin, Sidney
Schultz, Chester J., Jr.
Shiller, William R.
Shirley, Robert E.
Slage, Lowell E.
Thomason, Robert R.
Timby, Robert E.
Ulrey, Richard D.
Vessey, Robert A.
Watkins, Eugene A., Jr
Williams, Joseph F.
Wilson, James M.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Akers, Thomas G.
Alexander, Ross D.
Asche, Clifton A.
Berrian, James H.
Berry, Newell H.
Bialock, Jesse P.
Bloom, Henry H.
Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
Brown, Marvin J.
Buck, Charles W.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Connery, Horace J.
Dowling, James H.
Edwards, Billy M.
Ferris, Ezra F.
Feuquay, Donald E.
Fry, George E.
Haden, Hulot W.
Hine, Charles M.
Holcombe, John T.
Jordan, Robert D.
Lipes, Wheeler B.
Mateik, Edward D.
McAlpin, John S.
McConville, William E.
McIntosh, Francis W.
Meyer, William J.
Mitchell, Thomas G.
Nelson, Mason A., Jr.
Nichols, Lavern E.
Peckham, Samuel
Petoletti, Angelo R.
Ragle, Philip R.
Reed, Robert F.
Rudolph, Henry S.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Schlamm, Norbert A.
Sherin, Paul J.
Summerour, Thomas J.
VanMetre, Milton T.
Watts, Lloyd A.
Welch, Charles F.
Williams, Daniel N.

NURSE CORPS

Bracy, Edith L.
Breedin, Louisa F.
Bryan, Frances E.
Clemens, Rose M.
Conder, Maxine
Copic, Kathryn M.
Corcoran, Anna
Cordingley, Mary K.
Courtright, Barbara R.
Croteau, Marie A.
David, Rose M.
Finn, Celine A.
Fogarty, Anna L.
Foulks, Rose M.
Furmanchik, Helen I.
Gagnon, Eva M.
Hanley, Susan M.
Hanson, Dorothy M.
Hooker, Doris H.
Humphreys, Regina B.
Hundley, Barbara J.
MacDonald, Patricia H.
Miller, Jean L.
Morry, Mary R.
Murasheff, Linda D.
Murphy, Lorraine M.
Nielubowicz, Mary J.
Norris, Barbara
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Loah G.
Otis, Clara A.
Pampush, Ruth G.
Parent, Shirley M.
Perlow, Marion R.
Pfeffer, Elizabeth M.
Rebick, Bette A.
Rigsby, Helen M.
Robinson, Libia G.
Scarcello, Julia E.
Seabury, Marion M.
Sefchok, Ann
Shields, Dorothy J.
Shirk, Mary L.
Spence, Ruth G.
Steffens, Gloria M.
Stipe, Gloria J.
Stone, Charlotte R.
Vanatta, Rose L.
Vesper, Imogene L.
Walker, Ruby E.
Walters, Anna L.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Frank H.
Abbott, William A.
Abel, Allen
Ace, Robert F.
Achord, Earl W.
Adamcewicz, Francis A.
Adams, George C.
Adams, Joseph D.
Adams, Samuel W., Jr.
Aderholt, William L., Jr.
Adkins, William J.
Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
Ailes, Robert H.
Albero, Carl M.
Alberty, Roger E.
Albritton, Hugh H., Jr.
Albritton, James L.
Aldana, Louis P.
Alderson, Jack B.
Alexander, John C., Jr.
Alexander, William T.
Alien, George S.
Allen, Aquilla J., Jr.
Allen, David L.
Allen, George S.
Allen, Thomas R.
Allison, Kenneth L.
Allman, Thomas L., Jr.
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
Alvarez, Franklin F.
Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
Ambos, Brooks L., Jr.
Amero, Neil J., Jr.
Ammons, Clarence M.
Anderson, Anders T.
Anderson, Archie A.
Anderson, Edward E., Jr.
Anderson, Edwin K.
Anderson, George W., III
Anderson, George E.
Anderson, Lee R.
Anderson, Peter N.
Anderton, John H.
Andrews, Charles H., Jr.
Andrews, Thomas W.
Antonides, Gary P.
Apgar, Gillard W., Jr.
Appelhof, Gilbert A.
Appley, William H.
Archibald, Robert M.
Arcuni, Philip
Arenth, Ronald W.
Armbruster, James H.
Armbruster, Robert B.
Armstrong, Clarence E., Jr.
Arnett, Charles B., Jr.
Arnett, Chester L.
Arterburn, Robert C.
Arthur, Stanley R.
Ashford, George W., Jr.
Atkins, Brandon T.
Atwell, Robert F., III.
Aubert, Donald F.
Aucoin, James B.
Ault, Russell S.
Austin, Ellis E.
Avis, Dwight E., Jr.
Ayres, David R.
Ayres, Gordon K.
Backstrom, Einar W.
Badger, Terry M.
Badley, John T.
Bailes, Ralph T.
Bailey, James E.
Bailey, John H., Jr.
Bailey, Samuel M., Jr.
Baker, Donald A.
Baker, Harry J.
Baker, James C.
Baker, John K.
Baker, Peter A.
Baker, Ronald E.
Baldwin, Jack V.
Baldwin, Oa F.
Baldwin, Richard T.
Ball, Robert N.
Ballantine, James C., Jr.
Ballou, Joseph F.
Balsley, Joseph W.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
Bangert, James E.
Bank, Milton H., II.
Barbee, Walter E.
Barclay, Gordon J.
Barenti, Jerome C.
Barker, Ernest W.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Nathaniel C.
Barker, Richard H.
Barnes, Frank W.
Barnes, Paul D.
Barnett, Harris
Barnum, Craig L.
Barre, Albert
Barrett, Maurice J., Jr.
Barrett, Malcolm W.
Barry, Gerard E.
Bartee, William J.
Bartlett, Larry D.
Bartocci, John E.
Barton, Bryan W.
Barton, Robert L.
Basch, "N" Bernard
Bassin, Paul H.
Bates, Homer R.
Bates, Lawrence, Jr.
Bator, Stanley E., Jr.
Bauer, Herbert
Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
Baugh, Bernard R.
Baumgartner, Harry O.
Baumstark, Richard B.
Beach, Edwin C.
Beagle, Clyde A.
Beahm, John H., Jr.
Beamon, Joseph E., II
Bear, Dale F.
Beasley, Charles J.
Beatty, Don G.
Beatty, James R., III
Beck, Donald E.
Beckman, Robert J.
Beedle, Leland "S", Jr.
Beeler, Robert R.
Behrends, Paul O.
Bell, Robert T.
Bence, Richard L.
Bender, James E.
Bendit, Billy L.
Benjes, William B.
Bennett, Wesley L.
Bennington, Bruce A.
Benson, Burton O.
Bentley, Robert E.
Benz, Philip H.
Benz, Valentine G.
Berg, Robert F.
Bernstein, George
Bertelsen, Ralph I.
Beshoar, John M.
Best, David E.
Betterton, Thomas C.
Bevan, John A., Jr.
Bewley, Jack D.
Bickmore, Edward C., Jr.
Biele, Charles E., Jr.
Billings, Charles H.
Binger, James D.
Binsfeld, Arthur J.
Bird, Richard E.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Bishop, Benjamin M.

Bishop, Doyse R.
Bishop, Larry D.
Black, Arnold E., Jr.
Black, Richard O.
Black, Robert J.
Blackner, Ronald K.
Blaisdell, Sela A.
Blake, Raymond G.
Blakeslee, Dean T.
Blanchard, Lewis T.
Blanton, Ernest P.
Blasko, John E.
Blazevic, Raymond L.
Bledsoe, Howard W.
Blessing, George R.
Bletch, James W.
Blount, Byron A.
Blue, John J., III
Blum, James R.
Blumenthal, Richard W.
Bocim, William T.
Bode, Michael G.
Boerner, Delbert D.
Boggs, Harold A., Jr.
Boguslawski, William T.
Boice, Frank B.
Boling, James R.
Bond, Charles S.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Bornowski, John G., Jr.
Bornstein, Paul A.
Bostick, James H.
Bouchard, Joseph S.
Bouder, Raymond S.
Bouton, Samuel L.
Bower, Bruce B.
Bower, Richard D.
Bowers, Richard F.
Bowers, Robert L.
Bowlin, James F.
Bowser, Paul G.
Boxwell, William R.
Boyce, Heyward E., III
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyles, Harlan H.
Boyne, Peter B.
Boyster, Arnold E.
Braastad, Wayne A.
Brackin, James K.
Bradford, "J" "W"
Bradley, Frederick L., Jr.
Brady, Allen E.
Brainard, Hubert E.
Brand, Joseph N.
Brandenburg, Robert L.
Branin, John W.
Branscomb, Max "G"
Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Brazzon, Robert
Breckon, Richard L.
Breed, William L.
Brenner, Leroy E.
Breuer, Donald C.
Brewer, James V.
Brewton, Edward A.
Bridge, Winston J.
Bridgwood, Richard A.
Briggs, Richard W., Jr.
Brink, Charles W.
Britton, Jack B.
Brookes, Allan G., Jr.
Brooks, Dennis M.
Broos, James S.
Brough, Donald J.
Brown, Clarence E., Jr.
Brown, Donald C.
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, Grady W.
Brown, Howard S.
Brown, John S.
Brown, Kenneth C.
Brown, Parke L., Jr.
Brown, Peter J.
Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Randall R.
Brown, Randolph M.
Brown, Stanton L.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, William T.
Brown, William H.
Brown, William S., Jr.
Browne, Thomas M.
Brownell, Paul E.
Browning, Wayne B.
Broyles, Bill R.
Bruni, Richard L.
Bruns, Wallace R.
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, Don M.
Bryant, George W.
Buck, David E.
Buck, Wilbur P.
Buckner, James A.
Buckwald, Robert D.
Bueche, Arthur H., Jr.
Buechel, Joseph L.
Bull, John S.
Bullene, Richard E.
Bullock, Harold O., Jr.
Burcher, Philip E.
Burchett, Chester W.
Burchfield, Mitchel T.
Burdett, Calvin E.
Bures, Joseph C.
Burgess, Eric C.
Burgess, John E.
Burgoon, John R., Jr.
Burke, Thomas J.
Burleigh, David P.
Burleson, Frank M.
Burnett, Stanley R.
Burns, James W.
Burns, James M.
Burns, John D.
Burnside, Cecil A.
Burpo, James H.
Burrows, James B.
Burrows, Jack
Burton, James L., Jr.
Burton, Robert A., Jr.
Bush, Albert G.
Bush, Lowell E.
Bussmann, Richard J.
Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Robert P.
Butterfield, David L.
Buyers, Clarence
Byers, Carl A.
Byers, David I.
Byers, John M.
Bynon, Robert W.
Caciola, James J.
Cahill, Edward H.
Cahill, Lionel A., Jr.
Cain, William L.
Caine, Paul E.
Cameron, Edward J.
Camp, Joe D.
Camp, Lloyd B.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Robert B.
Canter, Richard D.
Carder, Harold D., Jr.
Carl, James P.
Carlson, Richard A., Jr.
Caron, Robert M.
Carpenter, Rex N.
Carpenter, James
Carpenter, Wayne D.
Carr, Albert J., Jr.
Carr, Samuel L.
Carroll, Charles S.
Carroll, John L.
Carroll, Joseph W.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carter, Charles S.
Carter, Herbert E.
Carter, Lawrence H.
Carter, Morris C.
Carter, Richard A.
Carter, Richard W.
Cashman, James M.
Cason, Louis J.
Casselberry, Frederick J.
Castle, Ronald G.
Catri, Leonard J.
Catron, Jerry M.
Caudry, Arthur R.
Chaffee, Roger B.
Chaffin, Kenneth D.
Chalmers, William C.
Chancy, Thomas M.
Chanslor, Richard M.
Charles, Richard N.
Chauncey, Arvin R.
Chavar, Samuel M.
Chayer, Arthur E.
Cheek, Wiley J.
Cheney, Frank J., Jr.
Christensen, John E., Jr.
Christensen, Ejnar S., Jr.
Christenson, Robert W. S.
Clancy, Wilbert C.
Clark, Fred L.
Clark, John D.
Clark, Loren L.
Clark, Thomas B.
Clarke, Douglas L.
Clarke, Lyle E. Y.
Clary, Robert A.
Clay, Harry B., Jr.
Clements, Robert B., Jr.
Clevenger, Redmond L.
Clock, Harry S.
Cobean, Samuel W.
Cobi, Frederick B.
Coburn, Harold E.
Cocchi, James G.
Cochran, William F.
Coe, Walter R.
Coen, Francis M.
Coffman, William R., Jr.
Cohen, Lawrence
Cokefair, Judson K.
Cole, Wade A.
Cole, William M., II
Cole, William F.
Coleman, James J.
Coleman, Joseph S., Jr.
Collins, David M.
Collins, William H., Jr.
Coltrin, Wayne E.
Comstock, George W.
Conn, Richard "L"
Conner, Eugene D.
Connery, John D.
Converse, Henry B.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Paul T.
Cook, Thomas L. P.
Cooley, Donald E.
Coombs, Alfred E., Jr.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, David S.
Copeland, John H.
Corbeil, Rodolphe N.
Cordle, "J" "T"
Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corrigan, William J.
Corsnitz, Robert E.
Cosgrove, Joseph J.
Coughlin, Eugene F.
Coulbourn, Samuel W.
Covert, Dana P.
Cowan, Terrance E.
Cowling, Cecil G.
Cox, Edward F.
Cox, James P.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Robert L.
Cox, William W.
Coyne, Thomas
Coyne, William L.
Craig, Harry E.
Craig, Robert J.
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Crandall, Donald R.
Cranford, William J.
Craven, John A.
Crew, Perry L.
Crichton, Ian R.
Crihfield, Raymond L.
Croghan, Clayton D.
Cromer, Charles C.
Cronise, Walter G., Jr.
Cross, Claude C.
Cross, Raymond
Crouch, "W" "L" Lamon
Crouse, David R.
Crow, Claron D.
Crowe, William M., Jr.
Crowell, Alton I., Jr.
Crumm, Richard D.
Cullen, Joseph P.
Cumblidge, Kenneth E.
Cummings, Billy W.
Cummins, Clarence M.
Cundari, Francis L.
Cunningham, Shaun
Curlee, John L.
Currie, William N.
Curry, Newell L.
Curry, William H., Jr.
Dallon, Dale S.
Daly, John S.
Dammann, Frederick O.
Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Louis D.
Darby, Thomas E., Jr.
Daughenbaugh, Robert L.
Daum, Richard A.
Davenport, Charles A.
David, Ralph H.
Davidson, John M.
Davis, Charles L.
Davis, Donald V.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Philip C.
Davis, Ray E., Jr.
Davis, Robert A.
Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Robert E.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davison, Gregory L.
Davison, James G., Jr.
Dawkins, Heibert C., Jr.
Day, Raymond D.
Dayhoff, James R.
Deagan, Thomas D.
Dean, Bill C.
Dearman, James M.
Debode, Donald G.
Deegan, Robert F.
Deesch, Earl H.
Defibaugh, Carl F., Jr.
DeGress, Francis B. III
DeLashmitt, Robert E.
Delo, David A.
Demarest, Joseph G., III
De Marino, Thomas V.
De Mars, Bruce
Demers, Henry J., Jr.
Dennis, Jefferson R., Jr.
De Noon, Norman L.
Dewey, Richard F.
Dewitt, Michael T.
Dickens, Russell D.
Dickey, James P.
Dickey, Kenneth R.
Didier, Jacob P., Jr.
Diehlmann, Charles J.
Dimond, Thomas E.
Disher, John S.
Dishon, William E.
Dixon, John C.
Dixon, Ned E.
Dodd, Donald C.
Dodd, Jimmy J.
Doherty, Joseph F.
Dollenmeyer, James K.
Dolliver, Richard H.
Donahue, John R.
Donnan, Earl L.
Donnegan, Richard
Donnelly, John J.
Donnelly, Thomas F.
Dootson, Eugene
Doragh, Robert A.
Dotson. John P.
Doubroff, Jerome S.
Doughdrill, Charles W.
Dove, Ray W., Jr.
Dowling, Lester C.
Driscoll, Joseph D.
Drumm, Thomas F., Jr.
Duba, Francis T.
Dudas, Daniel L.
Duffy, Leonard C.
Dugan, Ferdinand C., III
Dugan, William G.
Dulik, Andrew F.
Duncan, Garnett D.
Dunham, William C.
Dunlap, James H.
Dunlap, Stanton P.
Dunn, Charles E.
Duppenthaler, Robert J.
Durr, James E.
Duval, Jack L.
Duvall, Robert A.
Dvorak, Robert
Dwyer, William L.
Dyer, Barry J.
Dyer, Joe L., Jr.
Dyer, Thomas E.
Dyer, William E.
Dygert, Robert L.
Eades, Thomas A.
Earnest, William E.
Eason, Ward R.
Eastham, Jewell H.
Eaton, Joe W.
Ebmeyer, Walter C.
Edney, Leon A.
Edson, Robert W.
Edwards, Donald L.
Edwards, Jeremiah, Jr.
Edwards, Melvin J.
Edwards, Peter
Edwards, Walter J.
Egan, Robert W.
Ehrhart, Richard B.
Eiken, Donald N.
Eley, Clifford H., III
Elich, Robert L.
Eller, James B.
Ellingson, Norman D.
Elliott, Robert J.
Elliott, William B.
Ellsworth, Warren R., Jr.
Elwood, Robert W.
Emerson, Edward R.
Emery, Terry E.
Emmett, Richard F.
Engelhart, James H.
Engle, Raymond E.
Enkeboll, Richard E.
Epley, John K.
Epstein, Julian D.
Erikson, Theodore W.
Ermis, Leroy C.
Essig, John R.
Estes, William B., Jr.
Evanoff, John D.
Evans, Dewitt C., III
Evans, James C.
Everding, Edward J.
Evered, William H.
Fabiszewski, Robert V.
Fahey, William F.
Fahrney, David L.
Faires, Elbert W.
Fairley, Carl R.
Fannin, Grover F.
Farley, Edward B., Jr.
Farnsworth, Frederick F.
Farnum, Darrell A.
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Farrell, Richard C.
Fazzio, Raymond J.
Felt, Bruce C.
Felts, Robert W.
Fendler, Francis J., Jr.
Fennell, Abe P., Jr.
Fenton, William T., Jr.
Fergerson, Franklin E.
Ferlet, Leo G., Jr.
Fernald, Lloyd W., Jr.
Ferrell, Robertson G.
Ferro, James L.
Fickenscher, David B.
Fidelibus, William T., Jr.
Fidlar, Richard A.
Field, Benjamin H.
Fields, Cecil O.
Fields, Chester J., Jr.
Fields, David E.
Filbert, Arthur S.
Fine, Morton B.
Finley, John L.
Finn, William A.
Fischer, Warren H.
Fisher, Harvey E.
Fisher, Richard L.
Fisher, William C.
Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgerald, Bernard M.
Fitzgibbons, George P.
Fitzpatrick, Raymond F.
Fitzpatrick, Chester L.
Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
Fleming, Bruce S.
Fleming, Cecil H.
Fleming, Duncan A.
Fleming, Richard C., Jr.
Flickinger, Dean F.
Florko, Donald J.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, John J.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Folkins, Harry A.
Follmer, Lloyd D., Jr.
Fondren, George
Fong, Clarence
Foote, Ernest D.
Foote, William W.
Ford, Harold E.
Ford, Randolph W.
Fordice, James E.
Foreman, Merlin L. R.
Foresman, James H., III
Forman, Herbert
Forte, William R.
Foss, Robert N.
Foster, Naylor C., Jr.
Foulk, William H.
Fournier, Joseph O.
Fowlkes, Donald W.
Fox, John F. J.
Fox, Robert F.
Fox, Thomas R.
France, Morgan M.
Frank, Walter E.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franklin, William P.
Frankoski, John P.
Frear, Donald L.
Fredericks, Harold A.
Freeland, Wade H.
French, Douglas E.
French, Frederick A.
Frey, Robert D.
Friederick, Bruce
Fritz, David L.

Fritz, Wayne R.
Fry, Connie M.
Frye, William J.
Fulfer, Richard H.
Fuller, Charles A.
Fuller, Dale G.
Fuller, Roger W.
Funderburk, Jeryl D.
Furey, Edwin M.
Furtado, Francis J.
Gallagher, Joseph G.
Galvin, John P.
Gambill, Richard K.
Gant, James R.
Gaouette, Dudley A.
Garcia, Rodolfo C.
Gardella, John K.
Gardner, James R.
Gardner, Stanley W., Jr.
Garrett, Richmond D.
Garrett, William K.
Garvey, James J.
Gash, John A.
Gass, Joseph
Gatto, Paul J.
Gaudry, Byron A.
Gautier, Walter J.
Gawarkiewicz, Joseph J., III
Gearin, Billy D.
Gehrig, Jerome C.
Gellenthin, George A., Jr.
Gentz, Richard C.
Gessner, Winton S.
Giambattista, Michele D.
Gibson, Alfred P.
Gibson, Carl
Gibson, Donald "C"
Gibson, Douglas B.
Gibson, Ronald B.
Gifford, Sherwood E., Jr.
Giganti, George M.
Gilbert, Bertrand M.
Gilbert, John D.
Gilchrist, William F.
Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Gilliland, Lawrence A., Jr.
Gilmore, Francis L.
Gimber, Harry M. S., III
Ginn, James T.
Ginther, Larry L.
Giovanetti, Robert A.
Glancy, Robert J.
Glickman, Thomas W.
Glover, Fred "B"
Godbey, Thomas N.
Godefroy, Pierre L.
Godfrey, Jack L.
Gofus, Joseph G., Jr.
Gold, Edward F.
Golder, Thomas V.
Goldstein, Lawrence B.
Goldstone, Ronald G.
Gomer, Roy D.
Goodwin, James B.
Googe, James P., Jr.
Gookin, Robert B.
Gordon, Victor
Gorecki, Francis
Goslin, Ralph A.
Gossard, Charles A.
Gott, William B.
Gowans, George K.
Grady, Roger D.
Graf, David L.
Graff, Howard B.
Graff, Paul E.
Graham, George D.
Graham, Neil H.
Grant, Edward J.
Grant, Howard W., Jr.
Gray, Olin A.
Greaney, William M.
Green, Bernie L.
Green, Richard F.
Greene, William H., Jr.
Greeneisen, Kermit W.
Greenhoe, Duane F.
Greer, Joe C.
Greer, Robert E.
Gregory, Marion F.
Greiling, David S.
Griffin, David H.
Griffin, John I.
Griffith, Dwaine O.
Grigsby, Robert T.
Grimes, John E.
Grisbaum, Frederick "G"
Griswold, Charles D.
Grosscup, Stephen J., Jr.
Gruendl, Paul L.
Gubitosi, Michael J.
Guernsey, Charles H.
Guimond, Ernest E., Jr.
Guindon, Emmett T.
Gulliver, Victor S.
Gundersen, Gail E.
Gundersen, Matthew W.
Gunderson, Donald H.
Gustafson, Charles B.
Guthrie, William C.
Haas, William R.
Haeckler, William K.
Hagen, Dale N.
Hagen, Robert F.
Halberg, Paul V.
Hale, Bill J.
Hale, William F.
Hall, Charles R., III
Hall, David S.
Hall, Gordon B., Jr.
Hall, Irving G., III
Hall, Stanley J.
Hamilton, Charles D.
Hamilton, John E.
Hammack, John E.
Hammock, Donald P.
Handley, Paul L.
Hanna, Ira R.
Hanna, Ronald F.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hannah, Theodore B.
Hannify, Michael F.
Hanson, Ralph E.
Haralson, Joseph E.
Haralson, James B.
Hardenstein, Howard J.
Harjehausen, Lawrence O.
Harker, John V.
Harkins, Billy M.
Harkness, William L.
Harkreader, John R., Jr.
Harley, John K.
Harner, Charles F., Jr.
Harney, Patrick F.
Harper, Frances M., Jr.
Harrington, John R.
Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, James O.
Harris, Roger W.
Hartfelder, Richard F.
Hartman, Richard D.
Hartshorn, David R.
Harvey, Walter D.
Hassey, Milam B.
Hastie, Robert K.
Hatcher, Jerry M.
Hatfield, Duran T.
Hathaway, Paul L., Jr.
Haven, Robert R., Jr.
Havens, Harry S.
Haviland, Carlton E.
Hawk, Allan H.
Hawkins, Carl L.
Hawkins, Leroy T.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Haworth, Alvin G., Jr.
Hayden, Leroy M.
Hayford, James E.
Haynes, Harald J.
Hayter, Roscoe, Jr.
Heald, Jesse H., Jr.
Healy, Jerry F., Jr.
Hebble, George C., Jr.
Hefferman, Albert L.
Hegeman, Joey W.
Heisner, Robert I., Jr.
Heiss, William F.
Hellewell, John S.
Hemphill, Allen P., Jr.
Henderson, William L.
Henken, Raymond N.
Henry, Michael C.
Henry, Patrick, Jr.
Heppard, William E.
Herbert, Leo E.
Herbert, Roger G.
Herd, Robert V.
Hering, Frederick L.
Herlihy, John W.
Herring, George G., III
Herring, Thomas S.
Herzog, Harvey
Hester, James H.
Hewett, Donald H.
Hewitt, Wesley C.
Heyde, John S., Jr.
Heyde, Robert C.
Heydenberk, Delbert F.
Heying, Paul J.
Heyward, Shannon D.
Hibbard, Grant W.
Hickman, Thomas W.
Hiebner, Robert J., Jr.
Hiett, Orrie G., Jr.
Higgins, Theodore K.
Higgins, William H.
Higginson, John J.
Hildenbrand, Daniel C.
Hill, Carl M.
Hill, Eugene L.
Hill, John F.
Hillman, Bernard M.
Hills, Robert E.
Hine, Paul M., Jr.
Hines, Dean H.
Hipps, Carl E.
Hlava, Richard J.
Hobler, William J., Jr.
Hodges, Virgil C.
Hoffman, Albert L.
Hogan, Lawrence M.
Holland, Frank C., Jr.
Holland, William G.
Holland, Wylen R.
Holleman, Chester H.
Holmes, Henry D., Jr.
Holmes, Wayne M.
Holt, Arvil A.
Holt, John A., III
Holt, Shirley W.
Holtzclaw, John W.
Holzschuh, Jacob R.
Hood, James W., Jr.
Hoole, Frederick
Hooper, John R., Jr.
Hoppe, Herbert L.
Hopwood, Walter, Jr.
Horn, Benjamin
Horsefield, John E.
Hosey, "H" "P"
Houck, Charles E.
Hough, Van Q.
Housworth, Edwin P.
Howard, Frank A.
Howe, Frederic N., Jr.
Howe, Jonathan T.
Hower, James J.
Howland, John H.
Huebel, Melvin R.
Hughes, Robert S.
Hughes, Robert L.
Hughey, Ira A.
Humphrey, Harlow B.
Humphrey, William J.
Hungerford, Emerson A.
Hunsicker, Edmund K.
Hunter, Malcolm K., III
Hurd, John R.
Huseman, Frank W., Jr.
Hutchinson, Charles K.
Huth, Alton J.
Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Leo G.
Hyde, Ronald P.
Ike, William F.
Ingalls, James K.
Inman, Raymond E.
Irby, Irvine D., Jr.
Irlacher, Leonard T.
Irrgang, Ferdinand C., Jr.
Isenhour, William J.
Isquith, David A.
Jackets, Michael E.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, James P., Jr.
Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jacobs, John D.
Jacobsen, Philip H.
Jacobson, Lennart R.
James, James E. M.
James, Richard K.
James, Thomas P., Jr.
James, William B.
Jarrett, Edwin B.
Jasperson, Michael
Jaynes, David W.
Jefferson, Donald G.
Jennings, John L.
Jennings, Robert L.
Jensen, George W.
Jermstad, Glen L.
Jerome, John D.
Jewell, Arthur L.
Jewell, Harvey E.
Jines, Milton L.
Johnson, Allyn E.
Johnson, Edward H.
Johnson, Edward D.
Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Johnson, Leonard W., II
Johnson, Norman H.
Johnson, Paul S., Jr.
Johnson, Paul C.
Johnson, Phillip S.
Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Verlyn D.
Johnston, Clarence A.
Jones, Benjamin W.
Jones, Colin M.
Jones, Francis P.
Jones, Freasie "L", Jr.
Jones, Harold L.
Jones, Roy L.
Jordan, David C.
Jordan, Dennis R.
Jordan, William T.
Junghans, Peter A.
Kadas, Steven E.
Kail, Norman H.
Kaiser, Edward R., Jr.
Kampen, Kenneth B.
Kane, William R.
Kantor, Clifford S.
Karmenzind, William P.
Kaseote, George
Kassebaum, David L.
Katz, Bennett D.
Katzen, Murry
Kaufer, Richard A.
Kay, James R.
Kay, William G.
Keesling, Norman O.
Keir, Stephen D.
Keller, Lewis D.
Kelley, Wayne R.
Kelliher, Lawrence P.
Kelly, Larry K.
Kelso, Howard
Kemper, Ralph C.
Kennedy, Charles A., Jr.
Kennedy, Donald E.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Kennedy, Thomas C.
Kenney, Daniel J.
Kentopp, Donald E.
Kerr, William A., Jr.
Kershner, Robert L.
Kesteloot, Robert W.
Kesterson, Aubrey V.
Keyes, James L.
Keyes, Wayne P.
Kiefer, Martin D.
Kiel, Richard H.
Killingsworth, Monte L.
Kilmer, James "J"
Kimball, Paul E.
Kincade, Paul B.
King, Carleton J., Jr.
King, James W.
King, John D.
King, John W.
Kiper, William "D"
Kirkland, Thomas J., III
Kirkman, Clyde T.
Kivelle, William A.
Klein, Argyle G.
Klinger, Gerald F.
Klish, Theodore, Jr.
Knapp, Daniel L.
Knapp, Montelle N.
Knauf, Fredrick C.
Knauf, Richard H., Jr.
Kniveton, Robert
Knodle, William C.
Knott, Richard C.
Knutson, Jerry G.
Koch, Joseph W., Jr.
Koehler, Jay D.
Koehler, Norman E., III
Kofnovec, Robert G.
Kohn, Arthur F.
Kolstad, Thomas C.
Komp, Richard L.
Kopp, George E.
Korthe, James D.
Koster, Alfred M., IV
Koupal, Dennie J.
Kozak, Eugene J.
Kral, Anthony J.
Kramer, Theodore R., Jr.
Kratch, David A.
Krause, Edwin L.
Krebs, Dickson E.
Krekel, Lyman E.
Kremin, Richard A.
Krilowicz, Thomas J.
Kronzer, William W.
Kruetzfeldt, James H.
Kruse, Donald C.
Kuehler, Donald E.
Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kunkel, Larry D.
Kuntz, David S.
Kunz, Herman S.
Kurihara, Thomas M.
Kushner, David A.
Kuske, Loren L., Jr.
Laabs, Robert A.
Laboone, John A., Jr.
La Clair, Paul J.
Lafever, Jesse H.
Laing, James D.
Laird, Travis H.
Lamay, Urban R., Jr.
Lamb, Ellis R., Jr.
Lamb, Larry R.
Lampert, George E., Jr.
Landaker, John A., Jr.
Lander, William R.
Landmesser, Merl D.
Landon, William E.
Lang, William R.
Lang, William J.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Lange, William G.
Lanman, George M.
Larabee, Kent W.
Larkin, Donald R.
Larkin, Russell J.
LaSalle, Rene R.
Lasko, Harvey D.
Lastrico, Frank A.
Lauf, Joseph W.
Lavoie, Louis A.
Law, James E.
Lawler, Casimir E.
Lawler, Ervin J.
Leach, Lyle B.
Leahy, Richard N.
Leahy, Vincent J.
Leaverton, Richard R.
Leblanc, David C.
Leeds, Rene W.
Legare, Maurice T.
Lehman, Melvin E.
Lemerande, Lloyd R.
Lenhart, Mark M.
Leonard, Rex L.
Leonard, William J.
Lesko, Edward E.
Leslie, William N.
Lester, William E.
Leuschner, Robert L., Jr.
Levin, Richard R.
Lewis, Edmund F.
Lewis, Marwood D.
Lewis, Roy R., Jr.,
Licari, Philip R.
Lightner, Darrell A.
Lindstrom, Harry E.
Lino, Norman J.
Lipke, Allan E.
Lipscomb, Jack C.
Lisa, Donald J.
Little, Donald W.
Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, Gill F.
Llewellyn, Fred W., III
Lockshire, Robert A.
Lockwood, Morton
Lockwood, Robert K., Jr.
Loewenthal, Robert G.
Loman, Cleve E., Jr.
Lomheim, Louis G.
Long, Carl H., Jr.
Long, William T.
Longton, Andrew P.
Lonnegren, Robert C.
Loose, Rudyard K.
Lowe, Gary B.
Lowrance, Douglas L.
Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Lucas, Charles K.
Luedtke, Oscar F., Jr.
Luehring, Davidson
Lueker, Wendell H.
Luetschwager, Edward E.
Lufburrow, Charles B.
Lufkin, Richard M.
Luke, Charles T., Jr.
Luke, Robert A.
Lukefahr, David K.
Lunder, Hans W.
Lynch, Clayton W.
Lynch, Dale W.
Lynch, James J.
MacArthur, James D.
MacCubbin, George E., Jr.
MacDonald, Richard W.
Mackay, Richard W.
MacKenzie, Bruce E.

MacLeod, Wallace F., Jr.
Madara, Richard J.
Maddox, Ralph R.
Maddox, Rex A.
Madouse, Richard L.
Magner, Lawrence R.
Magnus, Ralph S.
Maguire, Thomas J.
Mahon, Edward J., Jr.
Mahoney, Charles A., Jr.
Mahony, Terrence M.
Malley, Kenneth C.
Mamele, Clayton C.
Mandel, Philip N.
Mann, John P.
Mann, Lawrence D.
Manning, James A.
Mansfield, James L.
Marcom, James C.
Marcus, Robert U.
Margedant, John W.
Marin, Richard
Markley, Harold R., Jr.
Markley, Wade E.
Marks, Arthur J.
Marnane, Thomas A.
Marovich, Michael
Marriott, Michael J.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marsh, David R.
Marshall, Harris A., Jr.
Marshall, Robert F.
Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
Martin, Harlen J.
Martin, John S., Jr.
Martin, Paul W.
Martin, William T.
Martinson, George P.
Marxer, Hugo E.
Massimino, Andrew S.
Masten, Lawrence E.
Masterson, James E.
Matarazza, Ralph A.
Mathieu, Roger A.
Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, Gary D.
Maxwell, Matthew T., III
May, Robert J.
Mayer, Richard T.
McAloon, John J.,
McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
McCabe, Ebe C., Jr.
McCahon, Richard J.
McCandless, John E.
McCarthy, James F.
McCartney, William A.
McCauley, George K.
McCauley, Hugh W.
McCaull, John W.
McClary, Richard C.
McClure, Gilson K., Jr.
McClure, William F.
McCollough, Willard L.
McConnel, Richard A., Jr.
McConville, James E.
McCracken, Richard L.
McCullough, Lawrence E.
McCullough, Robert F.
McCutchan, Milton L.
McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDaniel, Robert S.
McDonald, Gerald W.
McEachern, William H., Jr.
McFarland, Thomas G. Jr.
McGee, Donald J.
McGill, James A.
McGinty, Thomas J.
McGlasson, Daniel E.
McGrail, Charles R., Jr.
McGraw, Lloyd H.
McGuigan, David B.
McGuirk, William E.
McHenry, William G.
McHugh, Charles E.
McHugh, John T.
McHugh, William M.
McIlvain, William C., Jr.
McIntire, Charles R.
McIntyre, Patrick J., Jr.
McInvale, Joe B.
McIver, Robert C.
McKamey, John B.
McKay, Harry
McKeithan, Alton L.
McKenna, Michael F.
McKeon, Robert N.
McKinnon, Edward W.
McKnight, David R.
McLaughlin, Clyde L.
McManes, Albert S.
McManes, Kenmore R.
McMichael, George L.
McMillen, Kenneth A.
McMorris, John A., II
McMullin, Joseph F.
McMurtry, Thomas C.
McNamara, Laurence V.
McNeese, Carter V.
McNeill, James D., III
McNerney, James L.
McNichols, John P., Jr.
McPherson, Roger B.
McPherson, Robert E.
McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
McVay, Wesley J., Jr.
Mead, Gerald R.
Mears, William N.
Meaux, Richard P.
Mechling, Wallace B.
Medugno, Vincent R.
Meeker, Quentin S.
Meenan, Robert L.
Megehee, Louis D., Jr.
Megyesi, Charles B.
Meisner, George L.
Melnick, Norbert W.
Mendenhall, Ivan F.
Mericle, David L.
Meriwether, Joel T.
Merry, John F.
Meukow, Walter T.
Meyer, Allan G.
Meyer, David A.
Meyer, Richard E.
Michael, David B.
Mickle, William M.
Middleton, John E.
Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Miklos, Thomas J.
Millard, David R.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Edmund B.
Miller, George W., Jr.
Miller, Peter R.
Miller, Robert C.
Million, Daniel J.
Mills, Albert
Mills, Edward
Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Marvin L.
Mills, Neal O.
Miniter, Howard E., Jr.
Minnerly, Robert W.
Missailidis, Stephen
Misura, Paul
Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, David L.
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Henry H.
Mitchell, Ralph M.
Mitchell, Raymond F., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Mitchell, William J.
Moccia, Eugene P.
Modeen, Victor D.
Modrak, George P.
Moke, Paul D.
Monteleone, Vito J.
Montgomery, Donald J.
Montgomery, Herbert E.
Mooers, Christopher N. K.
Mooney, Andrew R.
Mooney, Harold L., Jr.
Moore, Aubrey A., Jr.
Moore, Donald L.
Moore, Harry R., Jr.
Moore, James A.
Moore, Jimmie R.
Moore, John W.
Moore, John T.
Moore, Rufus B.
Moran, Charles K., Jr.
Moran, Richard A.
Morcerf, Lester A., Jr.
Moreau, Ronald F.
Morency, Conrad R.
Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
Morgan, Lester A.
Morgan, Robert W.
Morris, Bernard G.
Morris, Clarence T., Jr.
Morris, Joseph M.
Morrow, Roy C.
Morsches, Robert W.
Morton, Stewart M.
Moses, Deryl E.
Mosman, Raymond A.
Mott, Louis D.
Moulder, Frederick W.
Moyer, Donald W.
Moyer, William J.
Mozley, Edwin A.
Mueller, John A.
Muhl, Charles P., Jr.
Mullaly, Raymond K.
Mullen, Cornelius W.
Muller, John G.
Mullins, Kenneth P.
Mumford, Robert E., Jr.
Murdoch, Richard P.
Murdoch, William
Murphy, George S.
Murphy, James H.
Murphy, John A.
Murphy, Joseph M.
Murphy, Michael A.
Murphy, Nicholas M.
Murphy, Ronald D.
Murray, Thomas R.
Mutz, "H" "O", Jr.
Myatt, Kenneth E.
Myers, John P.
Nace, Larry D.
Nagel, Richard C.
Nall, Harold W.
Nania, John J.
Neary, Joseph F.
Nelson, Bobby C.
Nelson, John H.
Nelson, Robert E.
Nelson, William J.
Nevin, Robert F.
Nevins, Peter G.
Nevins, Richard E.
Nevitt, James E.
Newby, Burton C.
Newcomb, Zeanious L.
Newell, John W.
Newton, Addison W.
Newton, Clifford A.
Ney, Kenneth L.
Nicholas, Joseph
Nichols, Richard D.
Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
Nider, Kenneth E.
Nielsen, Kenneth C.
Nielsen, Niel P.
Noggle, George A., Jr.
Nohlburg, Edward "B"
Noll, Charles F.
Nonni, John, Jr.
Nordell, Dean E.
Norman, Roy A.
Normand, Eugene J.
Norris, Francis C., Jr.
North, David M.
Northrop, Arthur L.
Nott, William J.
Nucci, Eugene M.
Nutt, Frederick W.
Obbink, Bruce J.
O'Brien, George E.
O'Brien, John B.
O'Brien, Lawrence B.
O'Brien, Walter H.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
O'Connell, James J.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Connor, Neil F.
O'Connor, Paul
Odea, Thomas V.
O'Donnell, John J.
O'Donohoe, Joseph P.
Ogle, Peter W.
Ogram, Donald T.
O'Hara, James P., Jr.
O'Keeffe, Frank P.
Oliver, Earl L.
Olson, Joseph D.
Ondak, Gerald S.
O'Neill, Brian E.
O'Neill, James P., Jr.
Ong, Richard E.
Oppedahl, Phillip E.
Ore, William E.
O'Rourke, Bernard F.
Osborne, Dale H.
O'Shaughnessy, John A.
Ostrander, Leroy C.
Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
O'Sullivan, Joseph F.
Otto, Max W.
Owen, William L., Jr.
Owens, Darrel D.
Owens, Robert S.
Padgett, Ervin E., Jr.
Page, Arthur "M"
Page, Henry H., Jr.
Painter, Cecil W.
Painter, Orville E.
Palmer, Edward J.
Palmer, Stanley B.
Palmer, William N., II
Pangle, Jacob W.
Pape, Frank F.
Papi, Lawrence A.
Pappas, Albert J.
Parcell, Kenneth H.
Parham, Gerald D.
Park, Newell D., Jr.
Parker, Frank W.
Parker, Ronald H.
Parker, Thomas W.
Parkhurst, Sherwood L.
Parnell, Ural C.
Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
Parsons, Robert A.
Partlow, James G.
Patrick, Andrew K.
Patrick, William M.
Patterson, Ralph A., Jr.
Patterson, Dale W.
Patterson, Jack L.
Paul, John S.
Paulk, James D., Jr.
Peace, John D., III
Peacher, Robert W.
Pearson, James W.
Pedersen, Dan A.
Peerenboom, William H.
Peirson, Robert A.
Pelphrey, Gary R.
Pember, Norman L.
Penley, Paul E.
Peresluha, Edmund J., II
Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
Perro, Michael A., Jr.
Perry, Richard C.
Persons, George R.
Peterman, John J., Jr.
Peters, Frank J., Jr.
Petersen, James C.
Peterson, Kenneth D.
Peterson, Paul A.
Petty, Ronald F.
Pharis, Wade J.
Phelps, Freddie J.
Phillips, George
Phillips, James M.
Phillips, John M.
Phillips, Rufus G.
Phillips, Samuel B.
Piasecki, Edmund A. D.
Piche, Paul D.
Pierce, Wayne M.
Pierson, Irwin B.
Pigg, Bobby J.
Pioske, William C.
Piotti, Walter T., Jr.
Pirie, James G.
Pirotte, James H.
Pistotnik, James J.
Pitney, James F.
Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
Polk, Lloyd E.
Pollard, Ronald T.
Poole, James R.
Poole, Ralph S., Jr.
Porter, Donald H.
Porter, Richard G.
Potter, Robert H., Jr.
Potts, Nicholas T.
Pouliot, Donald J.
Pounds, Philip C., Jr.
Powell, Daniel G.
Prenzlow, Roger E.
Prevo, Kyle T., Jr.
Priest, Robert E.
Pritchard, Joseph R.
Pritchard, Douglas F.
Promersberger, Edward S.
Prosser, Norman E.
Pruett, Ronald L.
Pruitt, Arnold W.
Pruitt, Harold P., Jr.
Prushan, Victor H.
Puerling, Peter N.
Pundt, Cameron A.
Purvis, Samuel M.
Putkonen, Edwin A.
Putman, James L.
Pyle, Loyd E.
Quandt, Edward C.
Quantock, Charles W.
Quast, Harry S.
Queen, Ronald J.
Quick, Robert A.
Quigley, Francis J.
Quinlan, Charles M.
Quinn, James H.
Rabb, Uil G.
Rachiell, Harold W.
Rae, Paul O.
Ragan, Charles P.
Ragone, Vito N.
Raines, Fredrick L.
Randall, Herbert T.
Randle, Benjamin W.
Randolph, Billy R.
Rangeo, Bennie
Rankin, Andrew M., II
Rasberry, Thomas H.
Rathbun, Denny R.
Rau, Ronald E.
Raudenbush, Peter V.
Ray, William, Jr.
Raymond, Calvin D.
Raymond, Robert H.
Reagan, Louis L.
Ream, Ronald L.
Reames, Raymond E.
Rebber, Roger B.
Reck, Joseph W.
Reed, Ned W.
Reed, Robert B., Jr.
Rees, James D., Jr.
Reese, Paul J.
Reeve, William F.
Reeves, Roy B.
Reich, Merrill D.
Reichart, Harold L., Jr.
Reid, James R., III
Reiser, Thomas F.
Reisner, George H.
Reiter, Paul M.
Reitmeier, Bernard S.
Rempt, Henry F., Jr.
Renner, Richard B.
Reno, William J.
Repp, Robert W.
Reynolds, John T., Jr.
Reynolds, Ted "W"
Rhoads, John D.
Rice, Lloyd A.
Rice, Loren M.
Rice, Oscar "G"
Rich, John P., Jr.
Richardson, John D., Jr.
Richardson, Howard V., Jr.
Richmond, Edgar E.
Richter, Eugene, Jr.
Richter, Paul G.
Richter, Ralph, Jr.
Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
Rigg, Richard G.
Rigmaiden, Ray
Rij, Michael A., Jr.
Riley, Joseph F.
Riley, William E.
Rimson, Ira J.
Ring, Stewart A.
Ritchie, Sherwood L.
Robbins, Doyne C.
Robbins, Philip D.
Roberson, Harold J.
Roberson, Robert B.
Roberts, Charles C.
Roberts, Charles A.
Roberts, Earl L.
Roberts, George L., Jr.
Roberts, James J.
Robertson, Lester S.
Robertson, Robert D.
Robinson, John W.
Robinson, Kenneth F.
Robinson, Robert G.
Roche, Denis P.
Rockmore, David M.
Rodke, Larry R.
Roeser, Walter V., Jr.
Rogers, William F.
Roll, Charles A.
Rollman, Gordon L.
Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
Romans, Robert W.
Romero, Melvin D.
Romoser, William K., Jr.
Ronni, James A.
Rook, Wilson C.
Roper, Daniel P.
Roper, Samuel V.
Ropiak, Joseph
Rositzke, Robert H.
Ross, Norman A.
Ross, Thomas E.
Rosser, David J.
Rotondi, Roger H.
Roudebush, Daniel L.
Round, Fay O., Jr.
Roxburgh, Kenneth M.
Roy, Herman E.
Rucker, William A., III
Rucks, Ronald A.

Russell, Cleveland H.
Russell, Earl H.
Russell, Richard E.
Russell, Richard W.
Russo, Anthony J.
Rutemiller, Oren G., Jr.
Ruthford, Donald C.
Ryan, Patrick F.
Rydzewski, James C.
Sachtjen, Jerry W.
Sailor, Edward A.
Sakey, Leyon D.
Salisbury, Jack S.
Sallee, Ralph W.
Sanborn, Robert R.
Santoro, Paul J.
Sapp, Edford W.
Saracco, Robert L.
Sawyer, Tommy D.
Sayers, Thomas E., Jr.
Sayles, Paul H.
Scahill, Lawrence J.
Scales, Gerald K.
Scales, Richard H.
Schafer, Dennis N.
Schaffer, David G.
Schaper, Delmar O.
Scheible, Jack W.
Scheidt, Peter J.
Schell, John J.
Schenk, Parley G.
Schenkel, Frederick G.
Schiavone, Anthony J.
Schildhauer, Edward W.
Schilling, Noel K.
Schimming, John G.
Schlwitz, Preston G., Jr.
Schleicher, Richard J.
Schmidt, Arnold C.
Schneider, Henry J.
Schneidewind, Gilbert P.
Schoeff, Kendall "E"
Schoen, Thomas J.
Schoonover, Richard T.
Schroder, Donald C.
Schulz, Paul H.
Schumacher, Duane O.
Schussler, Gerald A.
Schwaab, Denis T.
Schwartz, Hugh L.
Scoffield, Gary A.
Scott, Douglas L.
Scott, Lawrence J.
Seaman, Roy E.
Searcy, William P.
Secor, Richard A.
Sedor, Gerald
Segelhorst, Herbert E.
Self, Norman T.
Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
Shaffer, Bradford K.
Shaffer, Clyde H.
Sharp, Bill W.
Sharp, Walter H.
Shaw, Frederick A.
Shaw, Stanley S.
Shay, James E.
Shearon, Warren B.
Sheelor, Robert E.
Sherman, David D.
Sherrill, John T., Jr.
Shewmaker, John B.
Shields, Ronald M.
Shimmons, George R.
Shipman, Joseph
Shirley, Fred E., Jr.
Shirley, Gerald B., Jr.
Shirley, Vernon D.
Shores, Howard V.
Sibson, Tom R.
Sick, Gary G.
Siegmund, Harry M.
Sigg, Earl C.
Silvia, Charles P.
Simerly, Glen E.
Simmons, Robert R.
Simone, Thomas J.
Simonton, Bennet S.
Simpson, James H.
Simpson, John E., II
Simsarian, James R.
Sipes, John D.
Sistrunk, Allred, Jr.
Skelly, John F.
Skiff, Phillip H.
Slater, Larue D.
Sloan, Dennis Y.
Sloan, Roy A.
Sloane, Stephen B.
Small, Barton L.
Smith, Albert R.
Smith, Bennie J.
Smith, Bertram D., Jr.
Smith, Clarence L.
Smith, Don L.
Smith, Fred E., Jr.
Smith, George C.
Smith, Gerald S.
Smith, Howard E., Jr.
Smith, Jess J., Jr.
Smith, Jimmy F.
Smith, Lee O.
Smith, Leon L., Jr.
Smith, Leonard T.
Smith, Leroy B.
Smith, Lewis F.
Smith, Robert H.
Smith, Ronald D.
Smith, William S., Jr.
Smith, William E., Jr.
Smith, William J.
Smithey, William J. H.
Snell, William F.
Snook, Ernest B., Jr.
Snow, Kennedy B.
Snyder, Carl T.
Snyder, William R.
Sojourner, David E., Jr.
Solomon, Selig
Somerville, Jack E.
Southerland, James F.
Southern, Wilson E.
Southworth, Thomas E.
Spanagel, John D.
Spear, Jimmie E.
Speed, Laverne W.
Spillars, Harold S.
Spinks, Billy J.
Spitzner, Charles E.
Splitt, Robert F.
Spousta, Allen F.
Spring, Arthur T.
Springer, Emerson T.
Springer, Virgil E.
Spung, John R.
Stacey, John L.
Stallman, George L., III
Stampfli, Donald M.
Stanfield, Donald G.
Stanford, Robert L.
Stansbury, Donald O.
Starr, Joseph R.
Steelnack, Robert A.
Stegall, Woodie C., Jr.
Steinbrink, Earl E.
Steine, Zachery
Steiner, Frederick N.
Stennett, William A.
Stephens, John A.
Sterling, Robert F., Jr.
Stevenson, Leon M., Jr.
Stevenson, Frederick R.
Steventon, Raymond L.
Stewart, Edward L., Jr.
Stewart, George W.
Stickney, Maurice M., Jr.
Stiers, Lawrence K.
St. Martin, Arthur J.
Stober, Richard C.
Stockhausen, Edward L.
Stoeckel, Anthony W.
Stoetzer, Raymond N.
Stoke, Henry W., Jr.
Stokes, Bobby J.
Stong, Russell J.
Stoodley, Francis H.
Stoodt, William A.
Stouffer, John W., II
Stowell, Marshall A.
Stradley, George R.
Strahm, Kenneth A.
Strange, Robert O., Jr.
Strickland, Stanley P.
Strommen, Gene A.
Strong, Daniel L.
Stroup, Paul C.
Strunk, David W.
Stuart, Moore A.
Sturdivant, George W.
Sturm, Junior C.
Sullivan, Eugene T.
Sullivan, Homer H.
Sullivan, Jeremiah F.
Sunda, Lester R.
Sutherland, William R.
Sutphen, Harold J.
Swahn, Charles N.
Swanson, Matthew C.
Swaringen, Clarence S., Jr.
Swartz, Theodore R.
Swayne, William T. J.
Sweat, Wesley A., Jr.
Swift, Charles J., Jr.
Swink, Jay R.
Sykes, Floyd E.
Sylvester, Vincent
Syverson, Maurice S.
Tache, Warren N.
Tack, Oscar C., Jr.
Taft, Franklin L.
Taggart, Donald J.
Talley, Robert L.
Tambini, Anthony L., II
Tannahill, Wayne J.
Tate, Johnnie D.
Taunt, Melvin E.
Taylor, Gaylen D.
Taylor, James E.
Taylor, James H.
Taylor, Jeremy D.
Teague, Foster S.
Teasley, William A.
Tebbetts, William H.
Tema, Robert P.
Terry, Morris K.
Teter, Eugene V.
Thall, Raymond L.
Thaubald, Edward J.
Theriault, Willard
Thiele, Edwin R.
Thomas, Bruce A.
Thomas, David M.
Thomas, Dewayne A.
Thomas, James W.
Thompson, Harold L.
Thompson, John W.
Thompson, John S.
Thompson, Marrion R.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, Theodore R.
Thornsley, John T.
Thorp, Victor G.
Thorpe, Gordon L.
Thorpe, Jack C.
Thorpe, Paul J.
Timm, Dwight D.
Tims, Robert E.
Tish, Samuel A.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
Todd, Calvin L.
Tollinger, John N., Jr.
Toney, William C.
Tonnessen, Herbert G.
Toole, Morton E.
Torres, Louis J.
Touchton, John H., Jr.
Townsend, Gordon E.
Tracy, Earl V.
Trammell, Arthur B.
Treiber, Maurice L.
Trent, James A.
Troxel, Ralph E.
Truitt, Harry D.
Truxall, Charle W., Jr.
Tucker, Donald M.
Tucker, Robert F.
Turner, John J., Jr.
Turner, Robert R.
Tuttle, Clinton L.
Twitchell, Lawrence W.
Tylee, James G.
Tyszkiewicz, Arthur K.
Ulrich, John L.
Underhill, Samuel G.
Underwood, George C.
Unger, Phillip E.
Urry, Raymond L.
Vancil, Carl L.
VanDoren, Frank C.
Van Landingham, Clyde H., Jr.
Vann, Kenneth E.
VanOrden, Douglass L.
VanOutrive, Harold J.
Varnadore, James
Varshock, George A.
Vaughan, Edward B., Jr.
Vaughan, William H.
Vaughn, Alton L.
Vaughn, Charles G.
Veek, Eugene B.
Venable, David B.
Venezia, Howard
Vermillion, John E.
Victor, James A.
Viessmann, Alex J.
Vieweg, Walter V. R., Jr.
Vohr, James C., Jr.
Vollmer, Thomas H.
Vollmer, William E., Jr.
Vosseller, Richard T.
Vroman, Theodore J.
Vyskocil, James A.
Wade, Calvin W.
Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
Wagner, Harry E.
Wagner, John
Wakatake, Clifford K.
Walden, Warren L.
Waldman, Jay R.
Waldner, Clarence G.
Walker, Clarence L., Jr.
Walker, Muthey D., Jr.
Walker, Richard A.
Walker, Thaddeus O., Jr.
Wall, Arthur D., Jr.
Wall, Robert R.
Walling, Samuel E.
Walston, Jerry D.
Walter, Clyde M.
Walter, Harold B.
Walton, Charles R.
Ward, Donald, Jr.
Ward, Dorsey G.
Ward, James J.
Warden, Kenneth J.
Waring, James D.
Waring, Norman D.
Warnock, David R.
Warters, Robert L.
Watkins, William D.
Watson, John A.
Wattay, Alexander E.
Watts, Robert B.
Weaver, Sidney K.
Webb, Kenneth H.
Weber, Gerald M.
Webster, Audrey C.
Weichman, Denis R.
Weidetz, Carl J., Jr.
Weiland, Robert F.
Weise, Edwin A.
Weiser, Conrad W., Jr.
Weiss, Frederic C., Jr.
Welch, Richard L.
Wellborn, Robert M., Jr.
Wells, Carl C., Jr.
Wells, Charles T.
Werenskjold, Gary W.
Weseleskey, Allen E.
West, Herbert J., Jr.
West, William W.
Westlake, William R.
Weston, Jack L.
Whaley, Thomas P.
Wheeler, Paul G.
Wheeler, Robert C.
Whipple, Walter
Whitaker, "J" "B"
White, Alfred H.
White, George W., Jr.
White, John R.
White, Ray A.
White, Robert W.
Whitlinger, Gregory L.
Whitmer, Benjamin F.
Whitmire, Wilson R.
Wible, William K.
Wichmann, Robert H.
Wicks, Lester H., Jr.
Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
Wiktorski, Peter A.
Wilbur, Charles H.
Wilkerson, William A.
Wilkison, Teddy P.
Willey, Bruce T.
Williams, Albert P., Jr.
Williams, Carl E.
Williams, Charles L.
Williams, Doyne G.
Willis, Clyde P.
Willyard, Maurice D.
Wilson, Bruce D.
Wilson, Eldon C.
Wilson, Garry L.
Wilson, Leonard O.
Wilson, Robert M.
Wilson, Russell W.
Wilson, Warren C.
Wiltsie, Ronald J.
Winchester, Morton S.
Windham, Marshall E.
Wing, Rodney C.
Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
Winkeler, Joseph A.
Winn, Perry R., Jr.
Wirth, Charles G.
Witt, Robert T., Jr.
Woidyla, Frank J.
Wolfe, Roderic L.
Womack, Bernard "J"
Womack, Leonard R.
Wood, David G.
Wood, John D.
Wood, Richard G.
Woodrow, Warren A.
Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Francis G.
Woods, Walter E.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolman, Joseph C.
Worrall, Joseph A.
Worrell, Dwight I.
Worst, Dale R.
Wright, Arthur S.
Wright, Kenneth D.
Wright, Robert L.
Wright, Russell W.
Wyatt, Raymond E.
Wylie, Ronald P.
Wynn, Earl B., Jr.
Yarbrough, John M.
Yates, Walton E.
Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yenni, Kenneth R.
Yessak, Lawrence G.
Yetter, William S.
Yockey, Harry M.
Youmans, Virgil D., Jr.
Young, Arthur E., Jr.
Young, Billie R.
Young, Charles T.
Young, Sol
Yuskis, Edward C.
Zachman, John A.
Zaludek, George M.
Zelley, Richard N.
Zelna, Denis P.
Zimmer, Emory P.
Zollars, Allen M., Jr.
Zorbach, Anthony J.
Zurfluh, Robert M.
Zuver, Ralph M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abele, Robert B.
Adams, Richard G.
Agee, "D" "C"
Aldenderfer, William D.
Allen, Johnny L.
Allnutt, Alvin H.
Andersen, Thomas C.
Anglim, David L.
Avis, Bruce W.
Ayers, Leo R., Jr.
Baer, Burton E.
Balding, David W.
Barbary, Howard J.
Barstad, Clarence H.
Beaman, Thomas S.
Beck, Kermit "E"
Bell, Ralph W., Jr.
Benvenuto, Thomas, Jr.
Berg, Robert K.
Biggs, Sheridan C., Jr.
Bilodeau, James H.
Bradley, Donald A.
Briggs, John M.
Brown, Alan S.
Brown, Edward J., Jr.
Brown, Lee
Broxterman, Christian L.
Broyles, George D.
Buffoni, Thomas J.
Bullard, James R.
Buscher, Bernard A., Jr.
Carenza, John L.
Carter, Eugene T.
Cassimus, George D.
Chafey, William D.
Chambers, Jerry R.
Champion, Andrew A.
Chipley, Charles L., Jr.
Christian, Roy F.
Combs, Floyd E.
Corbitt, James R.
Costa, Richard D.
Croeber, Hans R.
Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crouch, Robert L.
Crutchfield, Lawrence D.
Cunningham, John H.
Del Duca, Ronald M.
Deshaney, Donald J.
Dewey, Edward P.
Dickinson, Thomas D.
Dietz, John H.
Dixon, Maurice E.
Dodds, Richard E.
Dodson, Dale E.

Donalson, Allison B.
Duffy, Joseph J., Jr.
Dunn, Bernard D.
Easley, Richard P.
Efird, Claud L., Jr.
Erickson, James L.
Farley, Charles V.
Field, Harvey E.
Fields, Simeon
Finbraaten, Laurence K.
Fint, Donald J.
Fitzgerald, Elonza B.
Frankeny, Robert U.
Furiga, Richard D.
Getrige, John J.
Gilvary, Daniel J.
Girman, Robert J.
Girod, Albert P., Jr.
Godsey, Shirley T.
Greene, Walter C., Jr.
Greenfield, Milton
Gumpert, Leroy C.
Hahn, Gary E.
Hale, Joe M.
Hall, Ronald T.
Hardy, Allen
Harlow, Charles E.
Heiberg, James E.
Hendren, Richard R.
Hinds, Douglas J.
Hinkle, Otis R.
Hollingsworth, Charles E.
Holmen, Philip C.
Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
Houghton, Donald W.
Hunt, Elmer G.
Hunt, Rutherford E.
Hutton, Raymond E., Jr.
Irons, John H.
Irvin, Floyd L.
Irving, Carl F., Jr.
Itzkowitz, Harold B.
Iverson, Ronald I.
Jackson, Ronald L.
Jahn, Donald R.
Jenkins, Vernon R.
Jensen, Nels P.
Johnson, Rodwell C.
Jones, Jack L.
Jones, Kenneth W.
Jones, Leland B.
Kachigian, George N.
Kalafut, George W.
Kase, Robert H.
Kelly, Arthur W.
Kriner, Lloyd B. W.
Kulikowski, Jack A.
Lane, Dean S.
Lantsberger, Robert E.
Lee, Gerald L.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
Liter, Theodore G.
Loftus, Raymond P.
MacAfee, Douglas C.
Magee Gilbert L.
Malzahn, Walter G.
Marino, Leonard J.
Martell, Richard A.
Martin, James E., Jr.
Martineau, Paul J.
Matthews, Orville D.
Mayer, James H.
McClure, Mason B.
McHugh, Thomas H.
Meiners, Arthur C., Jr.
Miller, James E.
Milliken, Gail L.
Milroy, Henry B.
Moore, Richard C.
Moore, Robert H.
Morse, William M., Jr.
Mouton, Earl F.
Mummert, Dale R.
Murphy, Allen R.
Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
Nace, Richard H.
Nielsen, David E.
Nissle, Donald E.
Nolan, John E.
Nuss, Gary B.
Nygaard, Richard B.
O'Connell, Arthur B.
Otto, Ronald E.
Pacofsky, Bartholomew
Palumbo, Frederick C.
Parke, William H., Jr.
Pata, Michael
Patterson, Jerry G.
Petras, George A.
Pettypool, Loyal B.
Phillips, Robert A.
Pierce, Leon L.
Pinnell, Joseph K.
Plante, Rene E.
Platt, Stuart F.
Pliska, Robert F.
Pope, Jere P.
Popik, Charles T.
Prahalis, Constantinus P.
Quartana, Joseph P.
Rader, Edwin A., Jr.
Rankin, Ronald W.
Reed, John D.
Reese, Richard A.
Reilly, Joseph V., Jr.
Robinson, Colonel P.
Robinson, Robert L.
Rook, Eugene C., Jr.
Rose, Robert P.
Roth, Arthur
Rubenstein, Ralph S.
Schoolcraft, Harold R.
Schulte, Conrad P.
Sechler, John L.
Seidel, James L.
Shea, Frederick G.
Sheehan, John E., Jr.
Shirley, Kenneth R.
Shoemaker, Leroy E.
Shroeder, John, Jr.
Sims, Thomas M., Jr.
Skelly, James F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas J.
Sodrel, Donald L.
Spilane, James J.
Squibb, Rodney K.
St. Martin, Robert W.
Stead, Robert H.
Stoeffler, John A.
Sutherland, Peter J.
Swartz, Alex E.
Taylor, William E.
Templeton, James R.
Terry, Victor W.
Thietten, Dwight O.
Thompson, Robert L.
Tilley, Philip L.
Utrup, Ralph A.
Vann, Louis E.
VanPatten, Edward R.
Vincent, Howard A.
Visniski, Walter W., Jr.
Vogele, James V.
Walker, Paul D.
Wallace, Edwin R.
Weaver, Johnnie R.
Webster, Harry G.
Weinberg, Harry H.
Weisinger, Thomas R.
Weller, Thomas C., Jr.
Whittaker, James B.
Wiggins, Don J.
Wilber, James R.
Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
Winslow, Donald F.
Woodward, Corbin, Jr.
Worth, George W.
Wright, Robert E.
Youmans, Raymond W.
Young, Jack L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barczak, Jerome J.
Bauer, John G.
Bligh, James E.
Brannock, Robert N.
Carle, Barry
Chabay, John L.
Chin, William
Clearwater, John L.
Cook, Carlisle F., Jr.
Cope, Ronald P.
Corley, Wentworth H., Jr.
Crisp, Hugh A.
Delage, Paul M.
Derr, Frederick M.
Dunn, Jerome R.
Earnst, Rossell A.
Endebrock, Frank L., III
Fegley, Charles E., III
Fraser, John C., Jr.
Frevert, Edward C., Jr.
Godsey, Jack L.
Gould, Charles H.
Grady, Noel "A", Jr.
Johnson, Don P.
Kirkpatrick, James D.
Klein, Dale M.
Kullander, Karl R.
Landes, William G.
Ledder, William R.
Loomis, Clarence E.
Mansfield, Douglas J.
McMenamin, Lester E., Jr.
McNeill, James E.
Merritt, Frederick D.
Mueller, Karl L.
Remular, William F.
Resnick, Rudolf
Sandlin, Steven M.
Schiffgens, Joseph J.
Schoenholzer, William J.
Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shafer, Richard V.
Siegle, Richard L.
Somerset, Harold R.
Tobin, James M.
Totten, John C.
Westcott, John A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Aaron, Alvin "J"
Baldauf, George W.
Bertka, Robert E.
Blankenship, William L.
Bolton, Richard B.
Bowden, Ronald R.
Bowdren, Laurence P.
Brideau, Donald J.
Bryan, James O.
Bryant, Eugene M., Jr.
Casler, Wilfred I.
Chastain, Howard T.
Collier, Patrick J.
Condon, Earl N.
Correll, Joseph M.
Crebs, Rollin L.
Dietz, Bruce J.
Dunham, Chester J., Jr.
Eckerman, Weldon R.
Ellis, Glenn M.
Erickson, Glenn R.
Erwin, Richard E.
Fernandez, Manuel S. P.
Flower, Norman L.
Formeller, Frank J., Jr.
Francis, Raymond D.
Freeman, Benjamin C.
French, James A., Jr.
Gobbel, Henry D.
Gonsalves, John H.
Gouldman, John R.
Greenwald, Alan F.
Halverson, Charles W.
Hatch, Emery J.
Hatten, Ann C.
Heaton, Harley L.
Hoover, Donald E.
Jenkins, Benny J.
Kane, George P.
Kemp, James E.
Kessler, Raymond B.
Lanier, Bobby M.
Lawson, Donald R.
Leadford, William M.
Lecas, Kenneth E
Littner, Henry D.
Lowe, Samuel C.
Lowi, Bertram H.
Martin, Douglas M.
Mayo, Myron F.
McAuliffe, Terrence J.
McClung, Denzel H.
McDermott, Roland W.
McFee, Charles A.
Millard, George W.
Moore, Charles J.
Mullinix, Chloe A.
Nelson, Paul D.
Nourigat, Earl R.
Novak, Paul J.
Nowak, Frederick F.
Pearce, Charles J.
Peckenpaugh, Normand L.
Pelletier, Louis E.
Ramsey, George W.
Roberts, Billie C.
Robinson, Jack V.
Rucker, Thomas J.
Sanderson, Roy D.
Seminara, James
Simmons, Carl B.
Sowers, Hubert H., Jr.
Stephens, Bobby L.
Stephens, Charles T.
Stitzel, Forrest D.
Surface, Robert L.
Swindall, Victor A.
Tandy, Roy W., Jr.
Thompson, Russell J.
Webb, Laurence H.
Wherry, Robert J., Jr.
White, Robert L.
Woomer, Edward F., Jr.
Young, Arthur L.
Zimmeht, John A., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Agnew, Lynnelle A.
Chute, Judith R.
Durian, Emma T.
Frazier, Frances M.
Gedrys, Patricia C.
Gillespie, Jacquelin C.
Higgins, Margaret J.
Lucas, Carol F.
MacEnery, Joan M.
Marcotte, Natalie M. G.
Matich, Marie F.
Rosenquist, Hildegarde
Thomas, Betty A.
Warner, Elizabeth A.
Wilson, Lela B.

Lt. (jg.) Emily L. Brown, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Lois E. Harden, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. (jg.) Glenn C. Culpepper, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Roger W. Olsen (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidate) to be an ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Evans Diamond
Charles M. Scott

Charles K. Phillips, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (enlisted personnel, U.S. Navy) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alfred S. Cerruti
Walter R. Conley
Carleton W. Emma
Bert C. Gregory, Jr.
Eddie W. Lewis, Jr.
Artie E. Meek
Emile E. Rovario, Jr.
Albert L. Sawyer
George I. Soule
Stanley C. Stringham

Homer Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a chief warrant officer, W–2, in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) as previously nominated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Robert B. Companion
*Wilburn C. Finch
*Albert Francescone
*George E. Head
*Grady F. Mesimer, Jr.
*George W. Stewart, Jr.

ORDNANCE SURFACE

*Bernard F. Brislenn
*Clarence G. Hager, Jr.
*Donald G. Hauser
*Austin C. Tilghman

ORDNANCE CONTROL

*James C. Armstrong
*Harold W. Echternach
*William Geil
*Walter D. Ouzts, Jr.
*Oscar H. Schmidt
*Clyde E. Slaughter

ORDNANCE UNDERWATER

*John W. Koerber
*John O'Brien
*Thomas H. Roberts

ADMINISTRATION

*Edward J. Baydowicz
*Eugene F. Burke
*Alexander D. Cameron
*Ralph W. Cavin
*John T. Dilley
*Charles W. Everstine
*James E. Garner, Jr.
*Leland L. Lydick
*Harold H. Merrill
*Floyd T. Samms
*Robert A. Strouts
*John W. Willis
*Theodore S. Zagorski

BANDMASTER

*Preston H. Turner

ENGINEERING

*Vincent Bayer
*William L. Bovee
*Lawrence Brown
*Albert C. Cacioppo
*William C. Credille
*John P. Desposito
*Harold W. Dundore
*Ernest O. Graves, Jr.
*James R. Harris
*Russel J. Luckey
*Thomas F. Marr
*Francis J. Minnock
*Alex "M" Nunnery, Jr.

*Alexander G. Patykula
*Bordeau J. Vassar
*Curtis G. Zimmerman
*Lonnie R. Redwine, Jr.

HULL

*William C. Powell

ELECTRICIANS

*Carl O. Blalock, Jr.
*Jack M. Hutchison, Jr.

ELECTRONICS

*Wayne E. Conner
*Walter F. Corliss
*James E. Dean
*Jack H. Dillich
*Roy P. Henderson
*Harley J. Higgins
*Onofrio Mammelli
*Marvin H. Suttmann

CRYPTOLOGY

*Dee Adkins
*Robert D. Arnold
Robert C. Beverly
*Gordon I. Bower
*Raymond G. Boyer
*William T. Browne
*John F. Cain
*Charles B. Campbell
*Paul W. Cooper
*Robert G. Creed
*Edward S. Custer
*Robert E. Dowd
*Thomas D. Elgen
*James S. Erven
*Robert R. Farrell
*Martin R. Fisher
*Harry R. Fuller, Jr.
*James K. Gordon
*William D. Hawley
*Floyd H. Heindl
*Orville C. Hinz
*Ephraim O. Jacques
*Richard S. Katzenberger
*Edwin S. King
*Ralph M. Paul
*Marion L. Piper, Jr.
*Richard V. Richards
*John R. Urquhart, Jr.

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Henry J. Bouchard
*Walter L. Broyles
*William L. Kurtz
*Paul E. Montgomery
*Frank A. Shelton
*James A. Thomas

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Charles W. Clark
*William J. Collins
*Richard R. Conger
*Keith G. Riley
*Walter L. White
*Mack Wright

AEROLOGY

*Robert E. Bass
*Francis J. McGayhey

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Joffre P. Baker
*Robert E. Biggs
*Richard E. Brandt
*Everett R. Buck
*Harold R. Cowden
*Wilson H. Crone, Jr.
*Richard W. Dristy
*Paul A. Hair
*Clarence H. Harris
*Walter Kachuck
*Lee O. Parks, Jr.
*William P. Roberson
*William K. Snow
*David L. Walsh
*Albert G. Wickham
*John A. Willett, Jr.

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*John O. Butterbaugh
*Russell W. Harper, Jr.
*William G. Hepburn
*Wesley I. LaRoza, Jr.
*Harvey L. Pace, Jr.
*Leroy Peoples

SUPPLY CORPS

*John A. Rausch
*Everett C. Smith
*Gerald H. Young

CIVIL ENGINEERS CORPS

*Winfred C. Mathers
*Charles L. Neugent
*John R. Stinson
*Willie C. Wall

The following named (meritorious noncommissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bobby L. Coleman
Wayne A. Davenport
William D. Fish
Charles R. Gordon
Kenneth M. Holder
Thomas R. Horn
Eugene S. Risler III
Leo K. Russell
Richard H. Russell

The following named (from the temporary disability retired list) for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer–4 in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frederick C. Buechmann, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kent V. Berchiolli
Richard A. Bishop
Terrence M. Bottesch
Ross C. Chaimson
Lloyd E. Gailey
Richard L. Hoffman
Robert D. Lewis
Everett E. York

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Carol A. Vertalino.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Julius P. Kish III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1961:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1965.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Richard S. Morse, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

William F. Schaub, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE
AMBASSADORS

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Thomas K. Finletter, of New York, to be the U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James J. Reynolds, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles Donahue, of Maine, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Frank W. McCulloch, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 27, 1965.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

J. Allen Frear, of Delaware, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1965.

William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961.

William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1966.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BOARD

Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961.

Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1965.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 2, 1961:

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mark Sullivan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Daniel J. McCauley, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

John P. Weitzel, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

John P. Weitzel, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1966, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 5: 1–2: *Be ye therefore followers of God and walk in love as Christ also hath loved us.*

Our Heavenly Father, who hast bound us to Thyself with the cords of love which nothing can break, may we now feel Thee nearer than we have ever known.

We humbly acknowledge that there is often within our hearts a strange commingling of fear and faith, of cowardice and courage, of doubt and assurance, contending for mastery and victory.

May the difficulties and disappointments which we encounter in the journey of life teach us to cling unto Thee with

greater tenacity and trust Thee more faithfully.

Grant that the blessings of freedom and democracy, which we possess so abundantly, may bring forth the fruits of justice and righteousness and brotherly love toward all men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-417, the Chair appoints as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SLACK, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MOORE.

AIR FORCE INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE BASE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow night, March 3, 1961, to file a report on the Air Force Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Base construction program.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, on the bill H.R. 4806, the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, and on rollcall No. 8, on House Resolution 167, with reference to appropriations for the Un-American Activities Committee, I am recorded as not voting. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on each of those issues.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday of this week to file a report on the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1961.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight, Saturday night, to file reports on the bills H.R. 5075, H.R. 3980, and H.R. 1163.

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

There was no objection.

OBJECTORS COMMITTEE ON THE CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the appointment of the following Members on the Republican side on the Objectors Committee on the Consent Calendar: the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD; the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. WEAVER; and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. PELLY.

As Republican Members on the Objectors Committee on the Private Calendar: the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AVERY; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the majority leader can at this time tell us of the program for the next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will withhold that for a while, a little later, in the next 15 or 20 minutes, I will be in a better position to announce the program.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, some of us live a considerable distance from Washington. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to an Easter recess. Easter will soon be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that now. I can assure the gentleman the matter is uppermost in the minds of the leadership on both sides. Speaking for myself, I will say it depends on what the legislative situation might be as Easter approaches so I am not in a position to say at this time, but that is something that any Member could speak to me about privately and the gentleman is perfectly welcome to make any inquiry but right now I am not in a position to say.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in fairness I ought to state that the majority leader and the Speaker have conferred with me about the matter of the Easter recess, and it is under very active consideration. As the majority leader has pointed out, the determination will be made, I am quite sure, in plenty of time for Members to adjust themselves accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that some of us live a considerable distance away and need to know well in advance. I am not pressing the point today.

Mr. McCORMACK. All that I can assure the gentleman of is the fact that it is uppermost in our minds. It is impossible to state definitely now. If I were able to project my mind ahead that far, I would be glad to do so but all I can say is that unless there is important legislation out of committee prior to Easter, I will give as long an Easter period as possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER M. MUMMA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is the paradox of life that we realize how much our friends mean to us, only after they are gone.

And then in mourning for them, we speak the words that were unspoken before.

In the crowded hours of this House, we are seldom aware of our dependence upon the experience, the companionship, and the human understanding of our colleagues.

When a Member we have worked with for years departs from this life, the emptiness in our hearts tells us of the loss that we have suffered.

In the course of time, it is inevitable that Members retire, voluntarily or involuntarily, but we can look forward to meeting them again and exchange reminiscences of the happiness and fullfillment we found in service to the people of our districts, and in service to the Nation.

The death of our colleague, Representative Walter Mann Mumma, has severed this bond of friendship in the middle of his active career as a Congressman, and just as we were settling down to the serious responsibilities of the 87th Congress, where we looked forward to his sound judgment and wisdom, to assist us in our deliberations and our decisions.

As a young man growing up in his native Pennsylvania, Walter was attuned to the unspoiled beauty of its woods and fields. In him was the urge to care for and develop its great natural resources

for the benefit of the public, today and through the limitless future.

After 5 years of work with the Pennsylvania State Forestry Service, he became a builder.

Always active in church and community affairs, he was honored by the people of the 16th Pennsylvania District, who elected him to Congress in 1950, and were so pleased with his stewardship that they continued him in office as their hard-working and faithful Representative at Washington.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, his creative spirit and his knowledge of construction brought a high degree of competence to the wide-ranging responsibilities of that body.

If his fellow Americans had been privileged to accompany Walter during a long and busy day, they would have carried away with them an inspiring memory of a public servant who never spared himself in working for the Nation. To strengthen its ideals, and to promote its true progress; these were the twin goals of his exemplary life.

In our sorrow at his death, we are humbly grateful for the years that he was with us, for no man could work side by side with Walter Mumma without growing in knowledge, in character, and in the spirit of human brotherhood.

To the family and friends back home we offer these eulogies to his memory, and our sincere personal sympathy.

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

TAX REFORM FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide a 30-percent credit against individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition to institutions of higher education.

My principal purpose in sponsoring this legislation of course was to facilitate the education of America's youth. A second reason for sponsoring this legislation involves my fundamental conviction that education at the college level should to the maximum extent possible be accomplished without Federal intervention. However, with the rising costs of a college education Federal intervention in the form of at least financial support seems inevitable unless an alternative is found to assist the American family in providing for the education of its children. I submit that this can be accomplished under a legislative proposal such as I have recommended. In recent decades the rising cost of higher education has imposed a heavy burden upon the taxpayer who seeks to provide for the education of his family. But in spite of the high cost we can never assume that education is a luxury to be enjoyed only by the privileged few. Education leads to knowledge and the latter is an essential prerequisite of good citizenship. The growth in education is demonstrated by the interesting statistics that 30 years ago only 20 percent of our young people between the ages of 14 and 18 attended high school while today the percentage of young people between the ages of 18 and 21 who attend college is almost twice as high. A college of today is what the high school was a generation ago. Confronted as we are with a shortage of skilled technicians, proficient professionals, and other occupational classifications, it is imperative that our society make every effort to maximize the educational opportunities available to our children.

It is not a question of can we afford the cost of good education; the real question is can we afford not to do everything possible to enhance the opportunity available in America to attend college. It is true that a revenue loss in the short run would result from the enactment of my bill. I am confident, however, that the longrun effect would be to increase revenue. The validity of this contention is demonstrated by the fact that only 15 percent of elementary school graduates earn over $6,000 but 66 percent of college graduates earn over this amount and as a consequence they will pay substantially higher income taxes on those incomes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will find it possible to take prompt and speedy action on this legislative request.

THE 83D ANNIVERSARY OF BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Bulgaria is one of the small countries in the Balkan Peninsula, but its freedom-loving inhabitants have played a very important role in Balkan history. These people have formed the backbone of the peasantry in the area for centuries, and they have been among the bravest fighters for their freedom. In the 14th century when the Turks invaded the Balkans, Bulgarians were forced to submit to the rule of Turkish sultans. For almost 500 years they had to live under Turkish oppression. In 1878 they were enabled, with effective Russian assistance, to free themselves. This act was confirmed in a treaty of March 3 of that year, and since then that date has become a Bulgarian national holiday.

Today on the observance of the 83d anniversary of Bulgarian Liberation Day unfortunate Bulgarians again find themselves suffering under alien rulers in their homeland, under Communist tyrants placed over them by the Kremlin. But they have no doubt that they will again be free, and as they succeeded in throwing off the Turkish yoke 83 years ago, so we can confidently hope that they will be successful in regaining their freedom from Communist totalitarianism.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an article appeared in the Scripps-Howard papers quoting the AMA Journal describing the Salk vaccine as "weak, worthless, and wasted." I think I might say in fairness to the AMA that such description does not represent the thinking of the American Medical Association nor of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks today statements from the AMA, a resolution that was adopted at their last meeting of the house of delegates and a recent statement by Dr. Luther L. Terry, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, and other material which I think will be of much benefit to the parents of this country who are greatly disturbed by this report.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be allowed to go into this matter so that the people of this country may be reassured as to the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine. Especially do I hope that such investigation and hearing be called well in advance of the late spring and summer months which usually are the dangerous ones as far as poliomyelitis.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 1, 1961]

VACCINE CALLED "WEAK, WORTHLESS, AND WASTED"—AMA JOURNAL NIXES SALK SHOTS

(By John Troan)

The Journal of the American Medical Association is telling physicians the 355 million doses of Salk vaccine given so far have been wasted.

It says the shots have been too weak to do any good. So doctors now should start inoculating everybody all over again—preferably with a special, souped-up (and costlier) brand of Salk vaccine recently put on the market.

This jarring advice conflicts with the recommendations of the U.S. Public Health Service—whose advisory committee of experts has ruled that four shots of any brand of Salk vaccine offer adequate protection to most persons.

It conflicts with the mass of scientific evidence gathered during the past 6 years in the United States, Canada, Britain, Denmark, and other countries—showing the Salk vaccine has greatly reduced the polio toll.

OWN BACKING

It even conflicts with the AMA's own endorsement of the Salk vaccine. Just 3 months ago, at its semiannual meeting here, the AMA's house of delegates proclaimed the vaccine has proved to be effective and urged its widest possible use pending availability of a new, live virus preparation that can be swallowed.

Despite this, the editors of the AMA's official publication are sticking by the statements in the current issue of the Journal—which goes to more than 179,000 doctors.

AUTHORITY

And one of the editors even charged, in a telephone interview, that the Public Health Service jumped the gun in licensing the Salk vaccine and has been trying to save face ever since.

The statements berating Salk vaccine are attributed to Dr. Herbert Ratner, whom the Journal identifies as a competent authority.

Dr. Ratner is health commissioner of Oak Park, Ill. He has been fighting the Salk vaccine ever since it was put on the market. At first, he complained it wasn't safe enough—then he began contending it wasn't strong enough.

Dr. Ratner's statements appear as a reply to an anonymous Wisconsin physician who asked about the value of polio shots.

Dr. Ratner says: "It is now generally recognized that much of the Salk vaccine used in the United States has been worthless."

He also contends nobody knows which shot is good and which isn't because the vaccine "is an unstandardized product of an unstandardized process"—a charge which brought a prompt rebuke from the Government's vaccine-licensing agency here.

Quizzed by phone, Dr. John H. Talbott, editor of the Journal, backed Dr. Ratner as a qualified health officer whose opinion must carry weight. Dr. Wayne G. Brandstadt, an editorial assistant who tapped Dr. Ratner for this assignment, added he is "a little inclined to agree with him."

SALK REBUTTAL

At his University of Pittsburgh laboratory, Dr. Jonas E. Salk retorted: "Experience in this country and abroad is contrary to that implied by Dr. Ratner in the Journal of the AMA. The fact that polio continues to occur is not due primarily to failure of the vaccine but failure to use it."

Dr. Talbott reported "We've had no comment from any physician" so far with regard to Dr. Ratner's comments. He said many doctors believe in the Salk vaccine and asked:

"Where are they? Why don't they protest?"

"This whole thing should be aired more than it has," Dr. Brandstadt added.

POLIOMYELITIS IMMUNIZATION

To the EDITOR:

If we assume that a yearly booster injection of poliomyelitis vaccine is needed because of the lack of potency in the present injectable vaccine, are we not inconsistent in principle to say that the patient who had the last injection—be it the third or the fourth—2 to 4 years ago can get the same protection by only one booster injection as the one who had the last injection 1 year ago? Furthermore, is it true that by next year the oral vaccine will have solved this problem?

M.D., Wisconsin.

Answer: The question rightly recognizes that recommendations of additional injections of the Salk vaccine relate to its low and variable potency. On April 19, 1955, only 7 days after the Francis Report and the promulgation of minimal requirements for the licensing of the vaccine, the USPHS found it necessary to reduce potency standards by two-thirds. The problem worsened late in 1955 when, to insure safety, it was necessary to introduce additional filtration during inactivation. This additional filtration resulted in a 10- to 30-fold loss in antigen (Illinois Medical Journal 118:85–93, 1960; and 118:160–168). Kelly and Dalldorf (American Journal Hygiene 64:243–258, 1956) reported a 600-fold variation in the potency of the Salk vaccine on the open market, from negligible potency upwards. The difficulty became enhanced when, on May 17, 1957, the Division of Biological Standards permitted lots of vaccine which had failed to meet minimum potency requirements to be retested, so that if the manufacturer then obtained a positive potency test, earlier negative tests could be disregarded. It is now generally recognized that much of the Salk vaccine used in the United States has been worthless.

It follows, then, that the true issue for the physician and patient is not how many injections, or how often, but whether the vaccine given or to be given contains dependable amounts of viral antigen. With the Salk vaccine this cannot be determined because it is an unstandardized product of an unstandardized process. Therefore, for the physician who prefers to know what he is giving, the choice rests with either the recently licensed killed poliovirus vaccine which is concentrated to a known and optimal weight of inactivated virus antigen, and which has substituted the Parker strain for the dangerous Mahoney strain, or with the standardized attenuated live poliovirus vaccine promised for next spring. In either instance, a complete course of vaccination is indicated, irrespective of the number of injections of the Salk vaccine given.

HERBERT RATNER, M.D.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1961]

INQUIRY IS SOUGHT INTO SALK VACCINE—LETTER IN MEDICAL JOURNAL AND NEWSPAPER ARTICLE TOUCH OFF DEMANDS

A letter in the current issue of The Journal of the American Medical Association led yesterday to a demand for a congressional investigation of charges that the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine is ineffective.

The letter was used as the basis of an article in the Scripps-Howard Newspapers in which the first paragraph said:

"The Journal of the American Medical Association is telling physicians the 335,000,000 doses of Salk vaccine given so far have been wasted."

This brought a quick, sharp denial from the American Medical Association and a demand from Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama, for an "investigation into the entire matter at an early date."

Mr. ROBERTS expects shortly to be appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has held that chairmanship previously.

DOCTOR'S LETTER QUOTED

The newspaper article was based on a letter written by Dr. Herbert Ratner, health commissioner of Oak Park, Ill., in answer to a question from an unnamed Wisconsin physician. It appeared in the Journal's issue of February 25. The Journal identified Dr. Ratner as one of its "correspondents."

Dr. Ratner said that "it is now generally recognized that much of the Salk vaccine used in the United States has been worthless." He went on:

"It follows, then, that the true issue for the physician and patient is not how many injections, or how often, but whether the vaccine given or to be given contains dependable amounts of viral antigen."

Dr. Ratner said that "with the Salk vaccine this cannot be determined because it is an unstandardized product of an unstandardized process."

He said that with a newer standardized Salk-like vaccine on the market and with the promise of an even better vaccine in the spring "a complete course of vaccination is indicated, irrespective of the number of injections of Salk vaccine given" earlier.

Mr. ROBERTS said last night that "I think that in view of all the evidence given when the program was adopted this appears to me to be a very unfounded statement."

He said that the "people of the country are entitled to the views of the eminent doctors and scientists to show that there is no foundation for this statement" by Dr. Ratner.

"We ought to have an investigation on the entire matter at an early date in view of the great concern of the parents of this country," he said.

THE AMA DISSENTS

The American Medical Association disagreed with what it called the sensational story in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

It said that the article's statement that the association believed more than "335 million doses of Salk vaccine given so far have been wasted" was "untrue and does not reflect the official position" of the association.

Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of the association, said the Scripps-Howard article presented "a highly distorted and inaccurate picture."

He said that Dr. Ratner's letter was his own opinion and "not the opinion of the American Medical Association."

He said that Dr. Ratner, "a well-known public health figure," has a "right to his own opinion."

Dr. Blasingame clarified the association's position on the Salk vaccine by quoting a resolution adopted by the organization's house of delegates at its clinical meeting in Washington last December. The resolution said:

"In view of the fact that oral polio vaccine will not be generally available in sufficient quantity in 1961 for any large-scale immunizing effort, the board of trustees of the AMA strongly recommends that the medical profession encourage the widest possible use of the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis. The Salk vaccine has been proved to be effective and since there are still many segments of the population not immunized against poliomyelitis every effort should be made to encourage the general public to take advantage of the Salk vaccine without delay."

The vaccine was also defended yesterday in a statement from Basil O'Connor, president of the national foundation.

He said that it had been proved "beyond any possible doubt—reasonable or unreasonable."

In New York City, Health Commissioner Leona Baumgartner said that the city would continue using the vaccine because "we found it both safe and effective in the prevention of polio."

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION STATEMENT

CHICAGO.—In a strongly worded statement, the American Medical Association disagreed today with what it termed "a sensational story" distributed to Scripps-Howard newspapers to the effect that the AMA believes that more than "3,500,000 doses of Salk vaccine given so far have been wasted."

"This statement is untrue and does not reflect the official position of the American Medical Association relative to the Salk vaccine," said Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of the AMA. "The Scripps-Howard story, emanating from Washington, leaves readers with a highly distorted and inaccurate picture."

The story was based on a correspondence question from an unnamed Wisconsin physiican which appeared in the February 25 issue of the AMA Journal. The correspondent, Dr. Herbert Ratner, Oak Park, Ill., health commissioner, said in part that "it is now generally recognized that much of the Salk vaccine used in the United States has been worthless."

"This," said Dr. Blasingame, "is the correspondent's opinion and not the opinion of the American Medical Association. Medical science advances because of conflicting viewpoints, and Dr. Ratner, a well known public health leader, has a right to his opinion."

Dr. Blasingame clarified the American Medical Association's position regarding Salk vaccine by quoting a resolution adopted by the AMA house of delegates at its clinical meeting in Washington, D.C., last December. The resolution said: "In view of the fact that oral polio vaccine will not be generally available in sufficient quantities in 1961 for any large scale immunizing effort, the board of trustees of the AMA strongly recommends that the medical profession encourage the widest possible use of the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis. The Salk vaccine has been proved to be effective and since there are still many segments of the population not immunized against poliomyelitis every effort should be made to encourage the general public to take advantage of the Salk vaccine without delay."

STATEMENT BY SURGEON GENERAL LUTHER L. TERRY

It is unfortunate that the viewpoint of a single individual, expressed in a national medical journal, should be erroneously interpreted as the official position of the American Medical Association. The truth is the direct opposite. The American Medical Association and the Public Health Service have long been closely associated in encouraging the widespread use of the Salk polio vaccine as a potent weapon against the incidence of paralytic polio. The results have been highly successful among vaccinated segments of the population.

Poliomyelitis vaccine as manufactured and used in the United States has been shown to have an epidemiological effectiveness of better than 90 percent in case of persons who have had 4 doses and better than 80 in the cases of persons who have had 3 doses. (Reference, Dr. Alexander Langmuir at the AMA Symposium.)

These findings are supported by an analysis of the potency of all vacines produced since it was originally licensed in 1955. (Reference, Dr. Roderick Murray at AMA Symposium.)

The median potency for types 2 and 3 has been satisfactory during the entire period the Salk vaccine has been in use. There was a period following the introduction of more stringent production requirements in 1955 during which the type 1 potency failed somewhat below the desired level, although this was not reflected in the epidemiological experience.

Potency has been in excess of the desired levels since early 1958 in the case of type 2 and 3 since early 1959 in the case of type 1. These upper trends are still continuing. The epidemiological experience in the United States has been corrobrated by findings in other countries, notably in Denmark, Sweden, Great Britain, and Australia. (This refers to the 3d report of the Expert Committee on Polio—WHO Technical Report Series 203 1960.)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS, who has served as chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee expressed his amazement to the article appearing in the Journal of the American Medical Association, stating that 355 million doses of Salk vaccine so far have been wasted.

"If this is true," the Alabama Congressman said, "The people of the United States have been lulled into the false belief that they are immune to the terrible disease of polio."

The Salk vaccine was highly publicized immediately after the announcement that the discovery had been made, and it was believed that every possible precaution had been taken to protect the public.

Congressman ROBERTS said that he will urge the committee to undertake a complete investigation of the allegations made in the Journal of the American Medical Association, and that all interested agencies of the Government will be called to testify, as well as members of the AMA.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH MARCH 8

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH MARCH 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next, March 7, be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 6

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the majority leader if he will advise us as to the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the gentleman's inquiry I will state that on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called.

The following bills have been scheduled for suspension if they are not passed by unanimous consent:

H.R. 845, veterans, Medal-of-Honor holders, pension increased.

H.R. 856, veterans, national service life insurance new plan. I understand that passed the House last year.

H.R. 858, Veterans' Administration medical installations. I understand that too passed the House last year. And if it does not pass by unanimous consent it will be programed for consideration under suspension.

H.R. 1882, operating loans, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

H.R. 5076, balance of payments bill. This is a bill the Ways and Means Committee has been considering. If they should decide to call it up and it does not pass by unanimous consent it will be programed for consideration under suspension.

Tuesday: Third supplemental appropriation bill for 1961. That will be followed by:

H.R. 4510, agriculture, feed grains for 1961.

Wednesday: H.R. 4884, social security aid to dependent children.

Any program for the remainder of the week will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether there is a possibility of the wage-hour bill being considered on Thursday or Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The best information I have on that bill is that it is now being considered by the full committee in executive session, and has been for a day or two. My best information is the executive-session hearings will take about a week. I cannot see any possibility of that bill coming up next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Are bills coming up Monday under suspension—all of them?

Mr. McCORMACK. If they do not pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. GROSS. And the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

FINO SEEKS TO END PENALTY IN SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the 1960 amendments of the Social Security Act went far to improve our system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, but the program still suffers from several unnecessarily restrictive and unrealistic provisions. Again, therefore, I have introduced my bill H.R. 3651 to remove these arbitrary limitations.

As one step that would help greatly to humanize the social security program, I renew previous proposals for repeal of the present arbitrary and restrictive "earnings test," "retirement test," or "work clause." This provision prevents some 2 million of our older citizens from receiving the monthly benefits for which they are otherwise eligible.

Under present law, insured working women may apply for monthly retirement benefits beginning at age 62 and men may apply at age 65. But in each case the individual is subject to a so-called earnings test under age 72.

The amendments of 1960 changed the rule as to how much a worker can earn and still receive benefit payments. But it still is a very tight rule. As the law now stands, if a beneficiary under age 72 earns more than $1,200 in a year, $1 in benefits is withheld for each $2 of earnings from $1,200 to $1,500. With earnings above $1,500, $1 in benefits is withheld for each $1 of earnings.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that no benefits are withheld for any month in which the beneficiary neither earns wages of more than $100 nor renders substantial services in self-employment, and that a beneficiary who wants to work can be sure that he will always have more in combined earnings and benefits than if he had limited his earnings to $1,200 or less. But at an extremely low point in the scale of earnings, a person under age 72 begins to lose $1 of benefit for every dollar he adds to his earnings. In other words, the law pushes these people

against an immovable wall. They have the peculiar, and often harrowing, experience of seeing their incomes stand still when their earnings increase.

The test is exactly the same whether a person has qualified for the minimum individual benefit of $26 a month—for a woman worker at age 62—or the current maximum benefit for a couple of $180 a month.

A retired worker's earnings will affect not only his own primary benefit but also the payments to dependents whose benefits are based on his account. The earnings of a dependent affect only his own benefit check.

Every individual under age 72 who draws any benefits in a given year is required by law to file an annual report of any earnings in excess of $1,200 and may be questioned at any time during the year. Failure to file reports promptly may bring severe penalties. Temporary suspensions of benefits are imposed where the administrative officers have some reason to think an individual is exceeding this earnings limit. Since the denial of benefits ordinarily occurs after the end of the year in which earnings exceeded the allowable limit, it may come—and very often does come—at the very time when an individual no longer has outside income and is in desperate need of the monthly benefit. The burden of proving that he did not violate the earnings test is imposed on each individual, and he can easily be tripped up by the many technicalities.

Comparatively, the test is hardest on those persons for whom retirement means the greatest relative reduction in living standards—those whose earnings before retirement exceeded the current maximum insurance benefit of about $120 a month for an individual and $180 for a man and wife. The penalty is especially stiff, also, for those in occupational fields in which the demand for specialized skills affords continuing opportunities for productive part-time activity after retirement from full-time work. For such persons, a relatively small amount of part-time professional or technical employment after age 65—or age 62 for women—may cancel many, if not all, their monthly benefits.

Mr. Speaker, since the test applies only to income derived from employment or self-employment, it discriminates against earned income and in favor of property income. No such test applies to the individual who gets his outside income from stocks, bonds, private annuities, accumulated savings, or any other type of property. The test is an earnings test—not an income test. Yet the very form of the test causes confusion. Many people think it is based on "need"—and a test of "need" is understandably resented by individuals who are otherwise fully qualified for retirement under this contributory social insurance system.

All this has caused people to resort to all sorts of arrangements designed to make the most of their combined old-age retirement benefits and earned incomes. It is a sad byproduct of our social security system that it encourages people to go as far as they dare—and then slaps on an often disproportionate penalty if they earn as little as a dollar more than the legal maximum. Some of these people would like to work and are wanted by employers because they would make a real contribution to production. Yet they are effectively discouraged from working; they have no desire to engage in a game of hide-and-seek with their Government.

This situation would be deplorable enough and would warrant legislative action even if the retirement test served a desirable purpose. But it no longer does so.

Changing prices and wage levels constantly alter the significance of the test prescribed in the law. Since the present basic exemption level of $1,200 a year was established in 1954, average weekly earnings in manufacturing have gone up by almost one-quarter; in building construction, by more than 30 percent; and in retail trade, by 12 percent. The Consumer Price Index has gone up by some 12 percent. Retired people need more supplementary income to cope with steadily rising living costs. Yet the law holds them to that $1,200 ceiling on exempt earnings under social security.

Mr. Speaker, the earnings test is an anachronism. It is far too restrictive for the economic world of today. The Government exhorts employers to hire older workers and keep them on the job. But the Social Security Act contradicts this policy. It says, in effect, "Don't keep them on the job very much." We must repeal this obsolete restriction.

It has been contended that repeal of the earnings test would require an increase in the rate of the payroll tax. But this assumption needs to be reexamined in the light of current conditions. The net cost of the liberalization voted in 1960 is estimated by the actuary at only one-fiftieth of 1 percent of covered payrolls. The financial aspects of the earnings test need to be reexamined in the light of current conditions.

Moreover, all the costs of the present provision need to be considered. The choice cannot be made in terms of the payroll contributions rate alone. What is the human and economic cost of this retirement test? The beneficiaries and their families bear a heavy direct burden. The inequities, the confusion, and the personal hardships that stem from the earnings tests are heavy costs, though they cannot be measured in dollars. And there are indirect economic costs as well.

Mr. Speaker, the social security system would operate more simply without the earnings test. I have no estimate of what it costs to obtain, review, and verify the millions of earnings reports, but I am sure the administrative expense for the trust fund alone runs into millions of dollars. Add to this the human and social costs entailed by the present system of administrative surveillance. Add the loss in tax revenues from people whose earnings are restricted, as well as the lost productive activity and the artificial scheduling of incomes, and it becomes evident that the law should be changed on grounds of economy, humanity, and good government.

Mr. Speaker, I bespeak the active support of my bill H.R. 3651 by all who are concerned for the welfare of our older citizens and their dependents. I am sure that when my colleagues examine the earnings test and what it does to people, they will agree with me decisively that it should be abolished.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD K. MILLS, JR., UPON RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Edward K. Mills resigned yesterday from the Federal Trade Commission. Commissioner Mills, a friend and constituent of mine, has seen many years of Government service at all levels. He served as alderman and mayor of my home town of Morristown, N.J. In 1939 and 1940 he was Chief of the Opinions Section of the Civil Aeronautics Board. From 1956 to 1960 Mr. Mills served with distinction as Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration. Last year he was appointed a member of the Federal Trade Commission by former President Eisenhower.

Commissioner Mills' statement is of more than usual interest because the agencies have recently come under critical review. It should be noted that Commissioner Mills politely disagrees with the recommendation of Dean Landis that the antitrust responsibilities of the FTC should be transferred to the Department of Justice, and that the responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration should be transferred to FTC.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD K. MILLS, JR., UPON RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

My resignation as a member of the Federal Trade Commission has been accepted by President Kennedy, and in leaving Government I would like to make a few observations designed to be helpful to the Commission in its future work.

I believe the Commission would benefit from a long-range program planning approach to its responsibilities in the particular industries or areas where the economic impact of its action could most help the national economy. Too often the entry of FTC into a certain industry or area has been by happenstance, rather than by carefully considered plan or intent, by reason of an application for complaint, or an announced merger plan, or an apparent violation of existing law. A small planning group, working closely with the five members of the Commission, could develop a long-range program as to what industry or industries, or what methods or practices, most need corrective action. A broad long-range plan, and an order of priority based on available staff, would serve as the blueprint for FTC action in the future. With such a plan the Commission, as well as industry, would know better what it was doing and where it was going.

While I appreciate that statistics in terms of the number of actions brought by the

Commission are evidence of aggressive law enforcement, the mere volume of work is of itself but one index of this agency's effectiveness. Of even greater importance is that major business evils be assessed from the standpoint of their impact on the public welfare and that the most harmful and substantial abuses be challenged first, regardless of how much or how little they may contribute to the statistical box score.

I also think the Commission should delegate more authority to its individual members, to its hearing examiners, and to certain of its staff officials in order to speed the handling of its workload without adding substantial numbers of new employees to the staff. Single Commissioners could dispose of many matters which now occupy the time of the full Commission, making possible greater emphasis on program planning, particularly in the antitrust field, by the Commission as a whole.

Also I believe that FTC's present dual approach looking toward improved business methods and practices is sound. To those businesses which truly desire to cooperate with Government, the helping hand of education and voluntary compliance should be offered. To the minority of recalcitrants the prosecutive paddle should be applied. The transgressions of a first and minor offender could certainly be treated with less formality than those of the seasoned and unrepenting violator of the law. Voluntary compliance, where obtainable, is a far less costly, and more comprehensive, solution than formal litigation.

Contrary to the recommendations of the Honorable James M. Landis, I do not believe that the antitrust responsibilities of FTC should be transferred to the Department of Justice, or that the responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration should be transferred to FTC. Under an informal and commonsense liaison arrangement, the existing concurrent jurisdiction of FTC and the Department of Justice in the antitrust field is well coordinated and effective. Both are performing well, although under different congressional rules and concepts, and in certain instances FTC actually has broader authority in the antitrust field than the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. What would be gained by eliminating FTC from this vast and relatively unexplored area is solely in the form of an improved organizational chart.

Likewise, there is no valid reason for transferring the duties of the Food and Drug Administration to FTC which was never legislatively designed nor scientifically equipped to handle anything other than advertising in this highly technical area. The regulation of this important field is being increasingly well and vigorously handled by the Food and Drug Administration, and to transfer it now would be arbitrary and unreasonable.

In leaving the Commission, I would hope that the five Commissioners can add to the momentum already achieved in the carrying out of the Commission's purposes. In the interests of fairness to the public and vigorous and honest competition in business, I wish them well.

DEDUCTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning.

The enormous increase in the cost of higher education during the past 15 years has created a condition which, in many instances, makes college attendance by qualified students economically impossible. My proposal is aimed at helping to ease the financial burden that a college education places on the average family in America. As we all know, the present tax laws do not make provision for a deduction of tuition and other educational expenses incurred by a taxpayer on behalf of himself or a dependent. The law merely provides for a continuance of the normal $600 exemption while a dependent is a student supported by the taxpayer. Obviously, tuition and maintenance far exceed that small amount.

No one can doubt that the education which an individual receives is often the determining factor in his future success or failure. At no time in our Nation's history has that been more true than today. The money which an individual spends on education, for himself, for his children, or his other dependents, may well be the most important investment he ever makes. More importantly, money spent on education pays dividends far into the future for the whole country. Therefore it would seem that the Federal Government should encourage individuals to invest in education by permitting at least a part of the expenses of education to be deducted from Federal income tax payments. Businesses are permitted to deduct business expenses on the grounds that such expenses generate further business and, in the long run additional revenues. This is surely true of education, for the differences in income levels among those with high school, college, and graduate degrees is a very well-known fact.

To help make a college education economically feasible to every qualified student, it is my hope that this legislation will be favorably considered and enacted into law.

FOREIGN TOURIST TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES: A NEGLECTED ASPECT OF THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite the attention of the House to a significant and long-neglected aspect of our foreign relations—the problem of attracting foreign visitors to the United States. In recent years American citizens have traveled abroad in huge and rapidly mounting volume, especially to Europe, acquiring and sharing with their fellow citizens a new breadth of understanding of the world beyond our shores which constitutes a positive asset to the effective conduct of our foreign relations. The flow of foreign visitors to the United States, on the other hand, has been a mere trickle, increasing slightly over the years, but only very slightly indeed. This discrepancy, I submit, is a critical problem warranting vigorous action by the Congress. The advantages to our foreign policy of travel by American citizens abroad can and should be matched by the concomitant advantages of promoting the widespread knowledge and understanding of the United States which can only come from firsthand observation by foreign citizens.

There are compelling reasons for action by Congress in the current session to encourage and facilitate foreign tourist travel in the United States. An immediately pressing reason is the significance of the travel dollar gap—the difference between the amounts spent by American travelers abroad and foreign visitors to the United States—for our overall balance of payments. The travel gap, which accounted for one-fourth of our total payments deficit in 1959, constituted almost one-third of the total imbalance in 1960, amounting to $1,150 million.

Equally compelling is the political, cultural, and educational significance of foreign tourism. The ignorance and misconceptions of the United States which prevail in many parts of the world, including even nations with whom we have close political and cultural ties, are a major asset to our Communist adversaries. This situation can be substantially ameliorated by encouraging a large-scale flow of foreign visitors to see for themselves the true character of the American people and their democratic institutions.

The extremely small proportions of foreign travel in the United States are amply illustrated by statistics compiled by the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. During the fiscal year 1960, 670,833 visitors' visas were issued to persons desiring to enter the United States for business, pleasure, education, and other temporary purposes. This figure, an all-time record, was a mere fraction of the number of Americans who traveled abroad during the same period. The country to whose nationals the highest number of visitors' visas were issued was Mexico, with 127,868. The British Empire was second, with 84,809. Nationals of the U.S.S.R. received 3,053 visitors' visas.

The number of nonimmigrant visas issued has increased more or less consistently but only very modestly over the years since World War II. The 1960 figure of 670,833 compares, for instance, with 252,978 in 1946, 339,889 in 1952, 496,087 in 1956, and 612,824 in 1958. The total dropped to 595,079 in 1959, so that the increase of 13 percent which occurred in fiscal 1960 is in fact less impressive than it appears.

The increase in the number of visitors to the United States has of course been reflected in increased dollar earnings from tourism. The Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce reports that tourists from Western Europe spent 18 percent more travel dollars in the United States in the first 6

months of 1960 than in the corresponding period in 1959, while tourists from Latin America spent 13 percent more.

These increases in foreign tourist spending, however, have been far too small even to stem the broadening of the travel-dollar gap, to say nothing of narrowing it. In 1958 Americans spent $1.8 billion abroad while foreigners spent $910 million in the United States, a gap of $890 million. In 1959 American tourists spent $2 billion abroad compared to $990 million spent by foreigners in the United States, a deficit of over $1 billion. In 1960 the tourist gap rose, as I have already indicated, to $1,150 million. The critical factor, as indicated by these figures, is that while both the volume and expenditures of foreign tourism in the United States are increasing, American travel and expenditures abroad are increasing more rapidly, with a consequent widening between payments and receipts in our international travel accounts.

While the U.S. Government has done a good job over the past decade of encouraging and facilitating travel by Americans abroad, its efforts to bring foreign visitors to this country have ranged from negligible at best to nonexistent at worst.

The Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce is an extremely modest agency. It has a total staff of only six people, including clerical personnel. Its budget was $58,000 for fiscal 1960, $161,000 for 1961. The functions of this office are essentially to coordinate international travel activities, to provide information, and generally to serve the travel industry as other offices in the Department of Commerce serve their various client industries.

Prior to 1960, the Office of International Travel was preeminently concerned with the promotion and facilitation of American travel abroad. The dramatic reversal of our balance-of-payments position has resulted in a new focus of the Office's activities on efforts to promote foreign tourism in the United States. The Travel Office acted as a sort of switching center for the private travel promotional activities connected with President Eisenhower's proclamation of 1960 as "Visit United States of America Year."

Attached to the Office of International Travel for purposes of maintaining liaison among the various agencies concerned in one way or another with international travel is an Interdepartmental Travel Policy Committee composed of representatives on the Assistant Secretary level of 12 agencies. There is also a Travel Advisory Committee, consisting of 27 prominent executives from all segments of the travel industry.

Whatever the merits of its performance hitherto, the existing Office of International Travel is far too modest an agency in its staff, budget, and scope of operations. This agency simply is not constructed to cope with the large-scale economic, political, and cultural questions inherent in the overall field of foreign travel promotion.

With a view to devising machinery suitable for the promotion of foreign tourist travel on a massive scale, I introduced on January 26, 1961, a bill (H.R. 3451) to establish a greatly expanded Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce. A similar bill (H.R. 1950) was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], on January 6, 1961, and companion legislation (S. 610), introduced in the other body by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, was enacted by the Senate on February 20.

This proposed legislation represents the culmination of several years of serious study of the problems of international travel.

An amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957 sponsored by Senator JAVITS directed the Executive to undertake a report on barriers to international travel. The resulting report, prepared by Clarence B. Randall, was transmitted to the Congress on May 12, 1958. The Randall report pointed to the enormous political, economic, and cultural importance of international travel and elaborated on a general conclusion that "the U.S. travel operation has suffered from lack of emphasis and stature." The report decried the lack of coordination among separate agencies concerned with aspects of international travel: visa requirements are handled by the State Department, entry eligibility by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, entry of goods by the Customs Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, health by the Public Health Service, tax matters by the Internal Revenue Service.

Among the most important of Randall's recommendations were the following: First, vigorous efforts by the State Department to minimize the procedural details involved in obtaining visas; second, the establishment of an elevated international travel office—similar to the agency proposed by the bill which I have introduced; third, the fullest possible use for travel promotion purposes of State Department and USIA facilities abroad; and fourth, experimentation in the use of preinspection procedures by Immigration and Naturalization officials stationed abroad.

The Randall report was forwarded to Congress by the President in the spring of 1958 with no recommendations or endorsement and no action was initiated in the Congress at that time.

A general invitation to foreign visitors was extended by President Eisenhower when on September 26, 1958, he issued a proclamation declaring 1960 to be "Visit the United States of America Year." The President called upon Federal, State, and local officials, as well as business, labor, agricultural, educational, and civic groups, to promote "Visit United States of America 1960" with exhibits, ceremonies, and other appropriate activities. No Federal funds were requested or provided for the "Visit United States of America" effort.

The program was spearheaded and coordinated by the Office of International Travel and a 25-member Visit United States of America 1960 Committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. In practice, the promotional effort was undertaken primarily by the travel industry. An elaborate "Travel United States of America Portfolio"—a rather poor effort, in my judgment—was compiled by the National Association of Travel Organizations and distributed abroad in eight languages. The Immigration and Naturalization Service contributed to the effort by designating some 90 young, blue-uniformed, multilingual female receptionists to act as "Welcome to America" staffs at major ports of entry. The Treasury waived the requirement for certification of compliance with tax laws for departing tourists who had spent less than 60 days in the United States. "Visit United States of America" committees were organized abroad by American embassies and consulates with the aid of travel agencies and the U.S. Information Service.

Visit United States of America was a modest success at best. Tourist travel to the United States did increase somewhat over 1959, but this was probably due less to the Visit United States of America promotion than to such factors as the rapidly mounting prosperity of Western Europe and consequent relaxations of currency restrictions.

The promoters of "Visit United States of America 1960" encountered two principal obstacles to their efforts. The first was the widespread apprehension among Europeans that travel in the United States would be prohibitively expensive—virtually nothing in the way of organized tours, package deals, and informative guide books was available to allay such fears. The second great obstacle was the popular impression among Europeans—by no means wholly unfounded—that virtually insuperable hurdles had to be overcome in order to acquire a visitor's visa.

At the NATO convention in September 1960—the other NATO, that is—representatives of the tourist industry agreed that promotional activities had been pitifully inadequate but that the really forbidding obstacles to massive tourist travel in the United States were high costs and the redtape of entry procedures.

Other assessments of Visit United States of America were even less charitable. Warren E. Kraemer, first vice president for traffic and sales of the Scandinavian Airlines system, pronounced the effort a spectacular flop due to rigid enforcement of immigration regulations by unimaginative bureaucrats of the State and Justice Departments, which agencies, according to Kraemer, threw obstacle after obstacle into the path of the foreign visitor. Time magazine on December 19, 1960, also pronounced the program a flop. Richard C. O'Brien, the travel expert in the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, flatly averred that scarcely any tourists were attracted by the Visit United States of America effort.

Visit United States of America, it seems clear, was a well-intentioned but grossly inadequate effort to deal with a problem of very large proportions. Not 1 cent of Federal money was asked for or appropriated for the program. It was nonetheless the first undertaking on the part of the Federal Government to attract foreign visitors to the United

States. This first halfhearted effort must now be followed by larger efforts—efforts of a scope commensurate with the problem to be dealt with.

My bill (H.R. 3451) to establish a new Office of International Travel and the companion bills introduced in this House and in the other body are designed to create adequate machinery for the promotion of massive tourist travel in the United States.

Such legislation was enacted by the Senate in 1960 but failed of action in the House in the final weeks before adjournment. This must be charged up as a gross failure of the 86th Congress.

The genesis of last year's Senate action was the dramatic reversal of recent years in our balance-of-payments position. A study of foreign trade conducted by the staff of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce revealed the enormous importance of tourism as the largest single factor in the total deficit in our balance of payments. Hearings on travel legislation were conducted before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 2 and 3, 1960. Statements by representatives of various agencies of the executive branch, including the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs were more or less unfavorable. A close study of these hearings suggests that these objections were motivated by bureaucratic conservatism and distaste for changes in administrative structure. Most of the witnesses at the hearings were representatives of various enterprises concerned in one way or another with international travel, and all of these witnesses expressed wholehearted support of the proposed legislation.

The committee reported a travel bill to the Senate favorably and unanimously after attaching substantial amendments to meet the objections of the Secretary of Commerce and others. In its report, the committee stressed the enormous significance of the travel gap, and above all, the fact that the gap is continually widening, at a rate exceeding $100 million a year. At the present rate, the United States will accumulate a travel deficit of over $20 billion during the coming decade. Rejecting the proposition that the widening travel gap was an inevitable phenomenon, the committee affirmed in its report that the travel gap, in large measure, was the direct consequence of a long series of deliberate policies, followed by our own as well as foreign governments, to foster and promote travel from the United States, together with the almost total absence of any reciprocal program to encourage travel to this country.

The travel bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was enacted by the Senate on June 7, 1960. It was taken up in the House of Representatives on June 8 and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it died.

It is this bill, Mr. Speaker, based on the most thoroughgoing study of the problems and potentialities of foreign tourist travel in the United States, which I introduced in the House on January 26, 1961.

The bill which I have proposed would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to develop, plan, and implement a comprehensive program for the stimulation and encouragement of foreign travel to the United States. The bill provides for the establishment in the Department of Commerce of a greatly enhanced Office of International Travel authorized to expend up to $5 million a year on travel advertising and promotion. The new Office of International Travel would be headed by a Presidentially appointed director who would also represent the Secretary of Commerce on any international travel committee that might be set up within the executive branch. The bill also calls for the establishment of travel offices in foreign countries as the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may deem advisable. The bill provides further for the establishment of a Travel Advisory Board of 12 members, at least 6 of whom would be representatives of the various enterprises which constitute the travel industry. The Travel Advisory Board would advise and consult with the Director of the Office of International Travel and submit reports, at least once a year, to the Secretary of Commerce and to the Congress.

The necessity for this legislation consists, as I have indicated, in urgent considerations of our balance-of-payments deficit as well as of political and cultural factors. The proposed expenditure of $5 million represents a very small investment indeed in relation to its potential returns. Foreign tourism is probably the only "export" of high earning potential which has been almost totally neglected by the Federal Government. While the U.S. Office of International Travel has been working on budgets of less than $100,000, Britain, for instance, spent $2.8 million in 1958 for the British Travel and Holiday Association, France spent $2.6 million for its Office of Tourism, India spent $1.5 million, the U.S.S.R. $500,000. Total foreign expenditures, public and private, designed to lure American travelers, probably exceeded $20 million in 1958. Foreign governments and private enterprises have reaped handsome returns from their investments. It is high time that we did the same.

There is every reason to believe, moreover, that a national program of tourist promotion will be easily self-supporting. Our own 50 States spend over $17 million a year on tourist promotion and their experience demonstrates that the amount spent is returned many times over in taxes resulting from tourist expenditures. It is estimated that $1 out of every $10 spent by foreign tourists in the United States ultimately finds its way to the Federal Treasury. Foreign tourists thus accounted in 1958 for over $85 million in Federal revenue.

For the reasons which I have outlined, Mr. Speaker—economic, political, cultural, and educational—the legislation which I propose is urgently needed. Action for the enactment of a travel bill is already completed in the other body. The bill was introduced there under bipartisan sponsorship and public hearings at which a broad range of travel industry representatives and other interested witnesses testified were held on February 2 and 3, 1961. It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will act promptly and favorably on my bill. It is needed as a positive instrument for the advancement of our national interests.

I should now like to invite the attention of my colleagues to another very important aspect of the question of attracting foreign visitors, the problem of removing burdensome obstacles, inconveniences, redtape, and even affronteries from the path of foreign nationals who wish to visit the United States. The establishment of the new Office of International Travel will serve to advertise, encourage, and invite foreign visitors—it will in effect lay out the welcome mat. It will still remain then to open the door. The travel bill should and must be accompanied by amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act and by reforms in administrative procedures designed to simplify and liberalize our exceedingly complex and rigorous procedures for obtaining visas and undergoing immigration, health, and customs checks. The travel bill will constitute an invitation. The sincerity of that invitation can only be demonstrated by positive measures to ease our entry requirements for nonimmigrant visitors to the United States. It would be a serious blow to the good name of the United States if we were to undertake a concerted program of tourist promotion and then subject the potential visitor to irritating and offensive obstacles to entry. To put it quite simply, if our tourist program is to succeed, we must first encourage people to come—and we must then let them in. I wonder how many of my colleagues in the House realize that thousands of visitors to our shores, by the time they are through with the redtape and the nonsense, come in with the feeling that they are not really wanted—that they are "foreign matter" that does not really matter much at that.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the procedures of nonimmigrant entry into the United States. Legislation to remove redtape and delays and to relax burdensome regulations, in my judgment, is the indispensable concomitant to the bill proposing a new Office of International Travel.

While in fairness the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service must be commended for significant measures already taken to ease entry requirements, there is still much to be done, both in the area of administrative regulations under existing law and through amendments to the law itself. While the executive agencies have not done all that they can to facilitate nonimmigrant entry procedures, much unfair criticism has been leveled against them that should in fact be directed at overly rigorous provisions of the law that they are bound to execute.

There are grave inequities in our imposition of severe entry requirements on the nationals of countries which have

paved a golden path for American visitors by eliminating visas, reducing customs checks to a bare formality, and devising elaborate tourist facilities. Many applicants for American visitors' visas, for example, are required to answer searching personal and political questions contained in a preliminary visa application form—form FS–257 AF—which may be required at the discretion of our consular officers. In the words of Paul J. C. Friedlander, the New York Times travel writer, in an article published on March 13, 1960:

> None of these questions help an American to explain to a European why the latter needs a visa to visit the United States when Western European countries require no visas of Americans.

The visa process essentially involves the decision by an American consular officer to grant or deny a visa to an alien applicant. A consular refusal, as a rule, closes the door to the United States. The consular officer must make two basic determinations: first, whether the applicant must be classified as an immigrant or a nonimmigrant; second, whether the applicant meets the qualitative requirements of the law. Although these qualitative requirements are the same under the Immigration and Nationality Act for nonimmigrants as for immigrants, they are in practice less rigorously applied for temporary visitors. The consular officer is enjoined by the act from issuing a visa if he knows or has reason to believe that the alien is ineligible.

The consular officer has broad discretionary powers. In describing the responsibilities of the Secretary of State for the administration of the immigration laws, the act—section 104(a)—specifically excepts the powers and duties conferred upon consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas. This provision, in my judgment, confers unduly arbitrary powers upon our consular officials and should be amended to grant the Secretary of State full power to reverse the denial of a visa by a consular officer. The bill which I have today introduced contains a provision to that effect.

One of the principal reasons for the frequently excessive zeal with which consular and immigration officers interrogate foreigners who wish to visit the United States is the fact that the Immigration and Nationality Act places on the applicant the entire burden of proof as to his genuinely nonimmigrant status. I refer to the provision, contained in section 214(b), that every alien "shall be presumed to be an immigrant" until he establishes to the satisfaction of consular and visa officers that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status. With a view to relieving the prospective visitor of this unwarranted presumption as to his status and motives, and for purposes of relieving our consular and immigration officers of what amounts to a statutory mandate for overly zealous and often offensive examination of potential visitors, my bill calls for outright repeal of the presumption of immigrant status in the Immigration and Nationality Act. This illiberal provision is wholly incompatible with any program of encouraging foreigners to visit the the United States and with the fundamental proposition that international travel is as beneficial to the host as it is to the visitor.

There has been substantial progress over the past 5 years in the liberalization of nonimmigrant visa procedures. A Presidential directive issued on May 26, 1954, instructed the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and Treasury to take appropriate measures to simplify all international travel procedures. The State Department issued a regulatory amendment on June 30, 1955, which authorized the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to most persons who were also registered on immigration lists. Simultaneously, the period of maximum validity of nonimmigrant visas was extended from 24 to 48 months for residents of countries which offer reciprocal privileges or require no visas of Americans. This measure was in accord with sections 221(c) and 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which require that, insofar as practicable, the validity of nonimmigrant visas and fees therefor should be governed by reciprocity.

After the issuance of the regulations of 1955, the State Department made representations to foreign governments for the liberalization of treatment of American visitors, with the result that 65 countries now issue 4-year nonimmigrant visas without fee to American citizens or require no visas at all and the United States in turn issues 4-year no-fee visas to nationals of all these countries. Fees for nationals of other countries are governed by reciprocity.

Under the statute visa requirements may be waived altogether on a reciprocal basis only for nationals of foreign contiguous territory and adjacent islands, that is for Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean area. The United States, therefore, cannot reciprocate visa waivers for most countries. This, I submit, is highly offensive to many of our closest friends and allies abroad and a major obstacle to foreign tourist travel in the United States. Accordingly, the bill which I have today introduced calls for granting authority to the Secretary of State to waive nonimmigrant visas, in his discretion, for the nationals of any country which grants reciprocal waiver to Americans. This is the key provision of my bill, the true test of the sincerity of our invitation to foreigners to visit the United States. The Travel Office bill, if enacted, will lay out the welcome mat before our door. The authorization of liberal visa waivers on a reciprocal basis will open that door.

The waiver of visas cannot of course be made mandatory but must be left to the discretion of the Secretary of State. It would be extremely unfortunate, however, if the State Department were to interpret such discretionary authority as a mandate for maintaining the status quo if it so wishes. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General acting jointly have full authority under existing legislation to waive nonimmigrant visas for Canada, Mexico, and the countries of the Caribbean area. To date, visa waiver has been granted only to Canadians. I strongly believe that such waiver should be extended at once to Mexico and at least some of the countries of the Caribbean. The Congress, in granting broad new authority for waiver of visas on a reciprocal basis, should make very clear to the Department of State its expectation that the Department will exercise this authority liberally, with due regard for the legislative objectives of encouraging a greatly increased flow of foreign visitors to the United States.

The statutory requirement of fingerprinting visa applicants was modified by Congress in 1957. This wise legislative enactment eliminated an irritating, insulting, and unnecessary requirement and the State Department now does not fingerprint nonimmigrant visa applicants of any nationality.

Visa application forms have been standardized. The official nonimmigrant visa application has been revised and simplified and now consists of a single-copy 3 by 5 card—form FS–257—requiring about 10 items of information, most of them required by statute. The preliminary questionnaire—form FS–257 AF—contains searching personal and political questions which are sometimes found highly offensive by visa applicants. This preliminary form is required relatively infrequently and is designed for cases where there is some question, in the judgment of the consular officer, as to the eligibility or bona fide nonimmigrant status of the applicant. The requirement of this preliminary form is entirely at the discretion of consular officers, who too often give undue offense by poor judgment in requiring this form of respectable and reputable foreign citizens. It does not seem feasible to impose legislative restrictions on consuls in the use of this form, but the State Department should make further efforts to overcome current abuses and might very well issue precise instructions to consular officers governing the proper occasions for the use of form FS–257 AF.

New nonimmigrant visa regulations, commendably designed to expedite and simplify visa issuance, went into effect on January 1, 1960. These regulations are editorially simplified and more logically organized. The requirement that an oath be administered in connection with a nonimmigrant visa application has been wisely eliminated and the applicant is now required only to declare the truth of the information given on the application form.

Double entry visas have been granted since 1956 on the basis of reciprocity and provision has now been made for easy revalidation of single-entry visas. Under prior regulations a visa could not be revalidated unless the alien was abroad. Under the new regulations revalidations up to a maximum period of 4 years can be accomplished by mail to the consular office which issued the original visa.

An applicant for a nonimmigrant visa, or other interested parties, may, in cases of refusal, appeal to the Department of State, which in turn may

call upon consular officers to submit reports in cases in which there is any indication that a visa may have been refused erroneously. The Department, however, may not direct a consular officer to issue a visa in any case, but it can give the consular officer an advisory opinion, and if an error in interpretation of the law has been made, the Department's ruling is binding.

The regulations provide that a visa shall be refused only upon a ground specifically set out in the law or regulations issued thereunder. They further provide that consideration must be given to any evidence submitted indicating that the ground for a prior refusal no longer exists. The Department or the principal consular officer at a post may request review of a case and final action by a consular officer other than the one who originally considered the application.

These provisions are laudable as far as they go, but the visa applicant is still subject to the arbitrary authority of a consular officer. To remedy, or at least alleviate this situation, the legislation which I have today introduced provides for specific authorization for the Secretary of State, after due investigation, to reverse any refusal of a visa.

Having obtained his visa and traveled to the United States, the visitor may still be denied entry by Immigration and Naturalization authorities. Here too procedures have been substantially eased, especially, as I have already noted, in connection with the Visit United States of America—1960 program.

The first official whom the incoming tourist sees is the public health officer, to whom he must show his vaccination certificate. If he comes from an area where other diseases are currently prevalent, he may be required to show other certificates of immunization. The health officer acts as a medical adviser to the immigration officer, advising him on exclusions for reasons of physical or mental defectiveness.

Next, the visitor sees the immigration officer, to whom he presents his passport, visa, and form I–94. Form I–94, issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, is a small identification card which is given to the visitor on board ship or plane. The visitor tells the immigration officer how long he wishes to remain in the United States and the officer stamps the passport and form I–94, indicating the duration for which entry is authorized and in what capacity the visitor is entering—for example, "B–1" indicates business, "B–2" pleasure. One copy of form I–94 is retained by the immigration authorities; the other is stapled to the visitor's passport.

It should be emphasized that the validity period of the visa has nothing to do with the period for which the visitor is granted permission to remain in the United States. The latter is determined by the immigration authorities, the maximum period for visitors being 6 months. The visitor must leave the country by the terminal date stamped on his I–94 form or apply to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for an extension. Approximately 70 percent of all initial requests for extension are granted. If an extension of stay is denied, the visitor has an extra 30 days beyond the terminal date stamped on his I–94 form to leave the country.

The final step in the entry process is customs inspection. In rare instances, the immigration officer may query the eligibility of the visitor to enter the United States. In such cases, the visitor is held for a hearing before a special inquiry officer under a procedure which is prescribed by the Immigration and Nationality Act. In practice, this procedure is applied to nonimmigrants only under the most exceptional circumstances.

Having cleared the three hurdles—health, immigration, and customs—the visitor is at liberty to travel anywhere in the United States without restrictions.

The purpose of both visa proceedings abroad and immigrations checks at our ports of entry is largely designed to distinguish the bona fide visitor from the potential immigrant or person who, once he enters the United States as a nominal tourist, will seek to employ various devices in order to remain on a permanent basis. What we have now is an unnecessarily cumbersome and frequently offensive system of double screening of potential visitors—first by visa officials abroad and then by immigration authorities at our ports of entry.

For reasons which I have indicated, I think it imperative that the law be amended to authorize waiver of visas for visitors from any country which extends the same courtesy to the United States. The waiver of visas on a large scale, I am well aware, will greatly increase the burden of screening visitors by Immigration and Naturalization officials. Moreover, it will raise the possibility that large numbers of people who fail to meet eligibility requirements will be turned back only when they reach our shores—a far worse situation than the denial of visas in the first instance.

It seems eminently desirable, therefore, that a system of preinspection by health and immigration officials be established in all countries for whose nationals nonimmigrant visas are waived. Under the legislation which I have today introduced, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized respectively, with the consent of the Secretary of State, to station immigration and health officials in one or more of our consulates in each of the countries for which the Secretary of State may waive the requirement of nonimmigrant visas. Submission to such preinspection procedures in their own countries should be entirely voluntary for foreign nationals, who would be free, if they chose, to defer the immigration check until they reached an American port of entry. Preinspection, in short, should be provided as a convenience and a service and not imposed as an additional obstacle to visiting the United States.

Even with the implementation of the reforms which I have proposed, there will remain the extremely awkward situation in which four separate agencies, each responsible to a separate executive department, exercise jurisdiction over the entry of foreigners into the United States. Jurisdiction over visas will remain, as it should, under the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State; immigration checks will still be conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is under the Department of Justice; health checks will remain under the Public Health Service, which is part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and customs controls will remain with the Bureau of Customs under the Department of the Treasury.

The Congress should undertake a serious study of the feasibility of unifying the last three of these functions—immigration, health, and customs—under a single agency. The difficulties of possible unification are readily apparent, and a workable scheme for unification does not come easily to mind. Nevertheless, the fracturing of the entry procedure under three separate jurisdictions is perhaps needlessly cumbersome from an administrative point of view and unduly complicated and irksome for the incoming foreigner. It would be extremely worthwhile, therefore, for the Congress to designate an appropriate instrumentality to subject existing immigration, health, and customs procedures to a thorough review and analysis, to examine the feasibility and possible schemes for administrative unification, and to report back its recommendations to the Congress. My own studies of the subject will continue.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to summarize the proposals contained in the bill which I have today introduced:

First. The Immigration and Nationality Act would be amended to authorize the Secretary of State to waive nonimmigrant visas for the nationals of any country which grants reciprocal privileges for nationals of the United States. This, as I have suggested, is the key provision of my bill, the true test of the sincerity of our invitation to foreigners to visit the United States, and a simple but significant act of amity and reciprocity toward nations which have long since extended this courtesy to the United States.

Second. The act—section 104(a)—would be amended to give the Secretary of State full authority to reverse the denial of a visa by a consular officer. The Secretary of State would thus be given the ultimate authority over the visa process that he now does not have.

Third. The clause in section 214(b) which deems that "every alien shall be presumed to be an immigrant" until he establishes to the satisfaction of consular and immigration officials that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status would be stricken from the act.

Fourth. The act would be amended to provide for the stationing of immigration and health officials, at the discretion respectively of the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the consent of the Secretary of State, in one or more of our consulates in any country for whose nationals the Secretary of State should waive the requirement of nonimmigrant

visas. Submission to such preinspection procedures would be entirely voluntary for foreign nationals wishing to visit the United States.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, combined with the bill providing for an aggrandized Office of International Travel, is designed to accomplish two things: to encourage foreign visitors to come to the United States, and to follow up this invitation by easing the path of entry in every possible way. The second purpose is the indispensable corollary of the first. It is not enough merely to exhort consular and immigration officials to be less suspicious and more courteous. The matter is too important to rest ultimately on the discretion of any officials, regardless of how able and conscientious they may be. The bill which I have introduced is designed to render mandatory under law an objective which is mandatory in fact for the advancement of our own national interests.

The promotion and facilitation of foreign tourist travel in the United States is on all possible counts good policy and good sense. The most immediately pressing reason is the necessity for positive action to help mitigate the alarming deficit in our balance of payments. Probably more important in the long run is the need to open new and vitally needed channels of communication between the American people and our friends all over the world, especially the democratic peoples of the nascent North Atlantic community. The ignorance and misconceptions of America that prevail in many parts of the world constitute an appalling obstacle to the advancement of our foreign policy objectives and, consequently, a positive asset to our Communist adversaries.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker—economic, political, cultural, and educational—a vigorous new effort is required to encourage foreigners to travel in the United States. My proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as well as the bill to establish a new Office of International Travel, are designed to advance this effort with the vigor and urgency that it warrants. It is my earnest hope that the House will act promptly and favorably on both of these bills. They are needed as positive instruments for the advancement of our national interests.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman stated 680,000. The figures that I have show that in 1959 there were 1,024,954. The exact figures for 1960 are not available, but by the best estimates that the Justice Department has it is 1,140,736.

Mr. LINDSAY. Well, I have my figures from the State Department, and what we are talking about is "visas issued." The Immigration Service probably gave you the figures for nonvisa as well as visa visitors—Canadians for example. I took my figures from the State Department because it is the State Department that has the responsibility for issuing visas. I will be happy to get together with the gentleman and compare these other figures at a later date.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman expect to get very much money into the United States from foreign tourists when they are coming here now in droves, with all their expenses paid by the American taxpayers?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman undoubtedly is referring to certain programs sponsored by the State Department, international student, and other cultural and educational exchange programs.

Mr. GROSS. I would not limit it to the State Department or any other one department. Almost every department and agency is spending money for that and other similar purposes.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman that these cultural and educational exchange programs are not exaggerated. They are modest in extent. The rewards from those programs are enormously profitable in terms of good-will relationships. I do not deny that there have been shortcomings, errors, mistakes; but on the whole these are sensible programs.

Mr. GROSS. I was not addressing myself to that point. I am pointing out that the American taxpayers are now bringing these people here by the thousands and paying all their bills. I do not know where the gentleman expects to get this foreign tourist business he is talking about.

Mr. LINDSAY. That is a subject quite apart from the one to which I am specifically addressing myself.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How would the enactment of any legislation by the Congress—and I assure the gentleman I am deeply interested in what he is trying to do—affect the laws of the various nations which prohibit their nationals from taking money out of their own countries?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman has touched upon a question of great importance. I think we have a duty in this country to do whatever we can to persuade those countries that do have such laws—and which are rethinking them, as the gentleman knows—to do whatever they can to relax those restrictions that they now have. But in the prosperous countries of Europe—Germany, for example, where there is a dollar surplus—it seems to me that a great deal could be done to encourage travel to the United States and have them spend those dollars in this country. Moreover, many of the prosperous countries have already substantially liberalized their restrictions on foreign currency purchases.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to commend the gentleman from New York for a very fine statement. He is certainly pointing up an area where with appropriate action we might do something to reverse what he calls the tourist deficit. In these days where we need additional dollars it seems to me that we could easily do more to encourage our foreign friends to visit this country. I think this approach is a very practical one.

May I ask the gentleman this question in connection with that: I wonder whether the gentleman does not think it is more important for us to encourage foreign visitors to spend more of their money in our country than it would be for us perhaps to reduce the duty-free allowance that we allow our own citizens when they return from foreign travel.

Mr. LINDSAY. Absolutely; much more important, although I do not mean to suggest that the question of a reduction in the duty-free allowance is not important.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman mentioned West Germany's being a country with a dollar surplus. May I remind the gentleman that a good deal of that comes from the $4.76 import duty that West Virginia pays for imports of bituminous coal from West Germany.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Will the gentleman explain a little further the $5 million appropriation and how this money is to be spent, particularly in comparison with the many millions of dollars that New York and Florida spend to try to attract people from other States into their States?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman's question is a good one. Let me point out that the States do spend a good deal of money in order to attract visitors to their States from other States, and also visitors from abroad. My research indicates that the 50 States spend in the neighborhood of $17 million a year on tourist promotion. Their experience, it seems to me, demonstrates that the amount spent is returned many times over in taxes resulting from tourist expenditure. It is estimated that $1 out of every $10 spent by the foreign tourist in the United States ultimately finds its way into the Federal Treasury. Foreign tourists thus accounted in 1958 for over $85 million in Federal revenue. In order to do this, you have to have a self-starting machine. This business does not grow and prosper in and of itself. Countries have demonstrated and shown that there is a direct relationship between the amount of flow of people into their areas and the effort they have put into promotion.

This last fall I was in the Middle East and Far East. I was interested in the efforts being made by two countries in particular to promote travel and tourism to those countries, and the immense rewards that have accrued to them as a re-

sult. I refer to India and Israel. In both of these countries there is a minister who is responsible for tourism. It is big business. As I pointed out, the tourist gap here is the difference between expenditures by foreigners in this country and expenditures by Americans abroad. This difference is conceded by all, I think, to be the single biggest item in the dollar gap we have now.

I do not suggest we make a Cabinet officer out of the proposed head of the Office of Tourism in this country, but I do suggest that with equipment, with funds, and with encouragement from the Congress and from the executive branch, we can adopt promotion procedures, advertising booklets, package tours, cooperative arrangements with private industry, and so forth.

It is going to require also, I expect, the aid of consultants and experts on the subject. It is a highly professional business and one that needs professional help.

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

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

Mr. KYL. There are several commercial enterprises within the United States which seek to attract American tourists to other countries. I assume that these planes and boats move in both directions and that the people who own hotels in foreign countries and in this country would as soon rent a room to a foreigner in the United States as vice versa. Are these companies spending as much money, do you know, trying to attract tourists to this country as they are in seeking to attract our people?

Mr. LINDSAY. No, I do not think they do. But more of them are now encouraging foreigners to come to the United States. They have discovered that to do this they have to hold out the hope that when people get here, life will not be as complex and as difficult as these people sometimes think. But it is interesting to note that since introducing this legislation and discussing this subject, the largest amount of mail I have received on the subject has been from those groups that you would think might normally resist having the Federal Government take part in this activity. The mail I have received indicates that private industry fully recognizes that there is a lack of coordinated effort in the business of attracting foreigners to this country.

Mr. KYL. Is it quite obvious that this demand for legislation of the type that you have been talking about comes from folks who are genuinely interested in the balance of payments and so forth?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. KYL. Rather than from commerical enterprises which would profit from same?

Mr. LINDSAY. It comes from both groups. I call your attention to this: The figures show that the travel gap accounted for one-fourth of our total payments deficit in 1959. You can check this with the Department of the Treasury. It constituted almost one-third of the total imbalance in 1960. In actual dollar value, the gap in 1960 amounted to $1,150 million.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is making an excellent statement on a subject which needs consideration, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman is making an excellent point right there at this stage of the development of his remarks. I would like to commend the gentleman on his effort. I would like to advert, if I may, to the gentleman's statement with reference to the origin of a substantial portion of the dollar gap. He said that travel was responsible for a large part of the dollar gap. Does the gentleman have a breakdown as to what part is due to money spent for business purposes as distinguished from that spent for private pleasure?

Mr. LINDSAY. I do not. It is an important breakdown and I will try to develop it as I pursue my research in this field.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think it would be very important.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman have any figures which would reflect a comparison between the dollars spent by an American tourist abroad and what a foreign tourist spends in the United States?

Mr. LINDSAY. I have only the total sum, which was over a billion dollars in the last fiscal year, but I do not have the breakdown on an individual basis.

Mr. COLLIER. Would the gentleman think the average would be anywhere near the same? Would it not conceivably be that the average American tourist going abroad spends far more in foreign countries than the average visitor from a foreign country spends in the United States when he comes here?

Mr. LINDSAY. I think that is a fair conclusion. As the gentleman knows, there has been a proposal by the administration to reduce the duty-free allowance from $500 per person to $100 per person. How much difference this might make is difficult for me at this point to say. I certainly think it is one that, while it may irritate some people, might go far toward correcting the specific imbalance to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. COLLIER. Does not the gentleman feel that the simple reduction of the amount that an American tourist may bring back into this country is actually but a flyspeck compared to what goes abroad through other channels?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am not so sure I would call it a flyspeck in view of the enormous prosperity of Europe at the present time. I think a great many Americans are not fully cognizant of the extent to which Western Europe has prospered very suddenly and very recently. This is one reason why we are in the process of rethinking our entire competitive position. It is necessary for the United States to learn how to compete with foreign countries in many areas, including the tourist business. It is very difficult; but I think the gentleman will agree with me that, in view of the enormous prosperity of Europe, the imbalance, that is to say, the amount of hard currency that is left in this country as a result of foreign tourist travel in the United States versus the amount of American dollars left abroad as a result of American travel, is bound to shrink. Let's help it to shrink.

Mr. COLLIER. Taking the total number of American tourists who go abroad and multiplying this by the present maximum, assuming no legislation is adopted to bring it down to the $100 figure, this would in fact still be a flyspeck, would it not, compared to the billions that flow abroad through other channels, justified in some cases and in others perhaps not?

Mr. LINDSAY. Possibly so.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. BROMWELL. Is it the gentleman's contention that this review procedure would simplify rather than complicate the matter?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman may misunderstand my point. I did not mean to leave the impression that we should establish appeal procedures. I do say that there are times when the Secretary of State or his immediate designate should have the power to order a reversal of the decision of the consular officer. This is not an appeal procedure. An appeal procedure presumably would be an appeal in Washington with all the trappings that go with an administrative appeal. I do not propose this, because I can understand exactly the point the gentleman is making. You could come up with a procedural structure that would be so complex that you would defeat the very purpose that you are trying to achieve. But, I am saying let us take the total burden off the field officer so that the decision he makes in his own mind is not ultimately the final one and let us give the ultimate superior, the Secretary of State, the power to enter in, if he so wishes, and say, "We think you are wrong. Go ahead and grant the visa."

Mr. BROMWELL. It would occur to me that if the purpose of the amendment is to expedite the flow of people to the United States, to involve two people rather than one would have the opposite effect.

Mr. LINDSAY. Not necessarily so. You have, in effect, two people in administrative practice right now. The regulations of the State Department provide that the next ranking consular official may alter the decision of his junior. But this is confined to consular officials abroad.

INCREASE IN PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

An editorial in the Washington Star of last year recalled an incident from the life of the late Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes. The Justice was preparing his income tax return with the help of a secretary. The secretary commented that she felt it to be unfair for a Justice of the Supreme Court to be so taxed. "I like taxes," said the Justice, "with them a man buys civilization."

This is indeed a true conclusion but few people think it through to that point. Taxes do buy civilization. And especially do they buy the peculiar American civilization which has seen the capitalist system flourish as it never did in the days of little taxes. It has flourished for many reasons but one of these reasons is that taxes have provided the capitalist system with a social conscience.

Ours is a civilization which provides hospital and medical care for the indigent poor and looks after the public health. It provides roads and a highway system because the people of our civilization desire mobility. Ours is a civilization which pays for public schools because our people demand education and our way of life requires it. The tax structure will again and again be remodeled and reshaped but the need for taxes will continue.

Mr. Speaker, while I call this a tax reduction bill, I do believe that its enactment will have just the opposite effect and will in the long run provide more revenue for our National Treasury and thus continue to meet the growing and expanding needs of a nation still far from reaching the saturation point of growth.

This bill will increase the annual allowance of deductions for personal income exemptions from $600 to $800, to become effective the beginning of the 1961 taxable year.

I am convinced that the present figure of $600 is wholly unrealistic now and has been for some time. The soaring cost of living has made it impossible to support an individual for 1 year on $600. Recent cost of living index figures published by the Department of Labor place this figure at 127.4, January 1961. This is an alltime high.

In proposing to adjust our tax allowance in such a manner I believe that we should bring our structure of taxation into a more realistic position. By doing so we shall give the general economy a much-needed boost. This measure, if enacted substantially as I have introduced it, will release over $100 million a week into the economy—spendable income released into the marketplace thereby providing substantial stimulus to the national economy.

The need for such a stimulus at this point is urgent. Unemployment is at its highest peak since World War II.

For the current fiscal year the previous administration anticipated a $4 billion surplus but that has dwindled away because of a gradual but persistent deterioration of business conditions. In fiscal year 1958 we saw what a decline in business conditions can do for our Federal budget. In that year we experienced the highest peacetime deficit in our history. This deficit was some $12 billion. This was not brought about because of spending appropriated by the Congress, nor was it because of emergency over spending by Federal agencies. Our peacetime deficit was produced because the business recession of that year reduced taxable income and thereby reduced Federal income. The Federal Government simply cannot allow business to slump again as it did in 1958 if it can be avoided.

Other indicators also show economic decline. There is the problem of the outflow of gold from the United States. The number of jobs in steel, automobiles, and machinery are down. Inventories, though recent figures show a decline, are still at a near record high.

Obviously we are experiencing another recession and we must act quickly to avert further decline and to help speed recovery. The President has shown much concern over this situation and I applaud his actions.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most effective ways to deal with the problem is to increase the net spendable income of America's people. Increasing the personal income tax exemption immediately will place over a hundred million dollars a week extra into circulation. With more money to spend, more goods will be purchased. More services will be required. Inventories will be decreased and with decreased inventories the production lines will again become busy. Bound to follow as a result of that, if appears to me, is an increase in the number of employed and increased tax revenues as a result of stepped-up industrial activity.

There is another very important area of our national life and concern which will be benefited by this bill. It is the all-important field of education. This provision will almost immediately allow more parents to put aside more money for the education of their children. It will provide encouragement to children who should and wish to attend college and at the same time it will contribute toward providing the college trained youth which our country needs at a minimum of expense to the taxpayer. This, I think, is one of the bill's most important benefits.

There is yet another very good reason why I have introduced this bill, Mr. Speaker. This bill contains provisions which will help just about every man and woman in the Nation and especially will it help the so-called little man, whose take-home pay would automatically be increased by the provisions of this bill. This will allow more money for food and milk, for rent and car payments, household appliances, home mortgages, and many of the services needed to maintain the contemporary American home.

I believe that every reasonable means must be used to avert a more serious recession. One of our most important duties at this session of Congress will be to act and act quickly to avert further economic stagnation. I feel confident that a broad attack will be made on this problem to reverse current trends of high unemployment, slowed growth, and bad business conditions. One of the main weapons with which to deal with the problem quickly is to place additional spendable income into the hands of the consumer.

Now is the time to bring our tax structure into better perspective. The $800 deduction allowance is realistic and fair. The effect that enactment of this measure will have on the national economy is urgently needed.

I earnestly hope that the Ways and Means Committee will hold early hearings on this bill. Action is needed. It is needed now.

BEWARE OF CAMPAIGN TO RESTRAIN GROWTH OF RAILROAD PIGGYBACKING

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is presently underway a campaign to deprive the public of one of the most promising transportation developments of our time. That development is piggybacking, which is the colorful term used to describe the movement of truck trailers, automobiles, and containers on railroad flatcars.

In recent weeks, some Members of the Congress including myself have received numerous letters demanding Government action to restrain the growth of piggybacking, especially for the movement of new automobiles, on grounds that it is enabling railroads to take business from trucks and hence putting truckdrivers out of work.

In a recent edition of the Teamsters monthly magazine, as well as in several specially prepared publications, teamsters and their wives and friends have been urged to write Members of Congress demanding special measures to curtail piggyback growth and thereby protect teamsters from railroad competition.

I can remember, as I am sure many of you can, when virtually all new automobiles moved by railroad. Then came vast Government expenditures for the construction of fine new highways and with these the development of new type trucks and trailers capable of carrying several automobiles direct from factory loading ramps to the dealer's door.

This was a service that appealed greatly to the automobile manufacturers. And because the costly highways and other required facilities were provided largely by Government, it was also competitive in price. The result was inevitable. The automobile companies turned to trucks, and the railroads lost virtually all of the new automobile traffic.

Now the railroads have devised means of providing a still better service at lower

cost. Piggybacking is proving itself not only in the movement of new automobiles, but also for a wide range of commodities. Its development particularly in the last few years has been little short of spectacular. Last year, with most other classes of railroad traffic on the decline, piggyback traffic showed an increase of about one-third. As compared with 1958, the increase was more than double.

Underlying this remarkable growth is a firm foundation of technological improvement, which includes not only such general improvements as dieselization, fully automatic freight classification yards, and centralized traffic control, but also a wide variety of technological breakthroughs in particular problem areas. Among the latter are developments in methods and equipment for loading and unloading trailers and in new types of freight cars, some capable of hauling two fully loaded trailers and the trilevel automobile carrier handling up to 12 standard size automobiles or 15 of the compact variety.

Improvements of this kind are the real reason for the railroads' improved competitive capability. As always the real beneficiaries are the users of transportation and the public as a whole.

The Teamsters' publications have stated that the ICC favors railroads, is railroad oriented, and have charged that the ICC has been packed with prorailroad people.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Of the 10 Commissioners presently on the ICC—there is 1 vacancy—only 2 have had railroad experience of any kind. One of these spent 6 years in railroad work, leaving in 1925; and the other 3 years with a State railroad association, leaving in 1949.

Nine of the Commissioners have legal backgrounds, and all 10 had distinguished themselves in private or Government work before their appointment to the Commission. One is a former Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky, president of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and special circuit judge; another is a former assistant attorney general of Colorado; another is a former assistant attorney general of Texas; and another a former Member of Congress and general counsel of the U.S. Post Office Department.

The Nation is fortunate indeed to have attracted men of such high caliber to direct the affairs of this unit of Government.

One of the Teamsters' publications asserts that—

> It is a matter of undisputed fact that the trucking industry is paying more than its share of the cost of the Federal highway program.

If this be an undisputed fact, it is certainly news to the Congress, which in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed that a study be made for the purpose of making available to Congress information on the basis of which it may determine what taxes should be imposed by the United States, and in what amounts, in order to assure, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways.

The Bureau of Public Roads in its recent report to Congress declares that the heavy vehicles, particularly the vehicle combinations—as compared with light vehicles and automobiles—are not bearing their share of highway costs. Further information on this subject will be available after results of the recently completed Illinois road test have been analyzed and submitted to Congress about the middle of the year.

The Teamsters also express concern that loss of truck traffic to piggyback will mean reduced revenues from the fuel tax and from license and registration fees for Federal, State, and local goverments. Overlooked is the enormous reduction in highway wear and tear and the positive and very substantial benefits in increased safety and convenience for other users of highways.

Another point one of the Teamsters' publications asserts is that in time of war the railroads, despite their boasts, would be the least effective and least dependable form of transportation. As a member of a special Armed Services Subcommittee which last year conducted an extensive investigation into the adequacy of transportation systems in support of the national defense effort in event of mobilization, I should like to call attention to our conclusion which appears in the report of October 10, 1959, as follows:

> No plans for transport dependence can fail to take into account the railroad industry.
>
> The versatility and adaptability of rail transport, as thoroughly demonstrated on a worldwide basis under all kinds of conditions, is but one of the reasons why military logistical planning is built around the railroads for the bulk of its freight and passenger movements. The other forms of transport, important as they are to the total need, are auxiliary and supplemental to the railroads.

Our subcommittee is not alone in this conclusion. It is shared generally by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the Department of Defense, and other authorities in the field.

The Teamsters sometimes contradict themselves. On the one hand they charge that railroad piggyback rates are so low as to cover only out-of-pocket costs or less; on the other they quote figures to show that earnings of the average piggyback car are over seven times higher than those of the average boxcar and conclude by saying:

> These figures illustrate what a lucrative operation piggyback really is.

Clearly the Teamsters cannot have it both ways. If piggyback is a lucrative operation for the railroads, and there is every indication that it is, then it cannot be held that piggyback rates are below cost, or meet only out-of-pocket costs.

With these reckless charges of unfair competition and ICC prejudice exposed, the Teamsters' real purpose becomes unmistakably clear. That purpose is to require railroads to maintain rates higher than necessary.

The concern of the Teamsters is the alleged loss of employment for truckdrivers, which they foresee if piggyback is allowed to expand. Naturally we all sympathize with anyone who loses his job and is forced to seek another, whether for reasons of advancing technology or any other. But let me remind the Congress what has happened to employment opportunities for railroadmen during the last generation, due in no small part to loss of business to trucks.

During the past 30 years, railroad employment has been cut in half: from 1,511,000 in 1930 to fewer than 750,000 today. Employees thus displaced have had to find productive employment in other fields, which is what anyone else would have to do, whose job has been abolished.

My answer is simply this: I am not now and never will become a party to an effort to block progress in any field, especially in transportation. Nor will I be party to any attempt to subordinate the public welfare to narrow interests, and I am confident that the answer of my colleagues in this body and in the Senate will be the same.

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY PARTICIPATION IN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, American electric utility companies are engaging in a broad program aimed at the development of economically competitive nuclear power, both independently and in cooperative efforts with the Atomic Energy Commission. Table I lists this participation according to plants in operation, plants under construction, plants under design, plants under contract negotiations, and projects in various planning stages. Table II indicates the estimated expenditures by these private investor owned organizations in the total effort. Table III lists individual companies participating in each of the 17 projects set out in table I and additionally lists 9 study, research, and development groups carrying on various efforts within that category. Table IV sets out the foregoing participation according to the types of reactors involved.

This is, indeed, a creditable and substantial effort of real value to the Nation and to the world. It will bring closer the day when the peaceful benefits of nuclear discoveries can become available not only to citizens of the United States but to the world at large. Since the effort is not as well known to the public as it deserves to be, it is my purpose to set out here some of the details of the 17 projects.

PLANTS IN OPERATION

First. Dresden Nuclear Power Station was designed and built by General Electric Co. for a firm price of $45 million.

Bechtel Corp. was the engineer-constructor. Of the contract price, $15 million was paid as a research and development expenditure by Commonwealth Edison Co. and the other members of Nuclear Power Group, Inc. The remaining $30 million plus the $6,300,000 cost of the site and company overheads was capitalized by Commonwealth Edison Co. First criticality was achieved on October 15, 1959; first electricity was produced on April 15, 1960. The plant went in commercial operation on August 1, 1960, and was dedicated October 12, 1960.

Within its license limitation of 630 megawatts thermal, this dual-cycle boiling water reactor plant has demonstrated a net capability in excess of 180 megawatts. The plant has met or bettered all design specifications. Edison was preparing to apply for a modification of its operating license, to permit running at a higher thermal level, when a metallurgical problem developed involving part of the control rod mechanism. The plant was shut down in November and General Electric Co. is now in the process of correcting the drives. Operating data accumulated prior to shutdown was as follows:

Reactor service hours	2,711.5
Turbine-generator service hours	2,239.58
Megawatt-days, electrical	11,482.4
Megawatt-days, thermal	37,597.9

During the above extended period of operation at various power levels, the plant demonstrated ease of operation and rapid response to system load requirements.

Second. The Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s 136,000 kilowatt—net electric—pressurized water reactor at Rowe, Mass., has now been essentially completed and is in preliminary test operation a bit ahead of schedule and materially within the cost estimate. The fuel elements are stainless steel clad uranium oxide. Experience to date indicates that the plant's performance will somewhat exceed specifications.

The project was undertaken as part of the power demonstration reactor program and was estimated to cost $50 million. When all costs are booked, they are now expected to amount to less than that estimate. Arrangements have been made to finance up to $57 million, including cost of the initial core, working capital, and preliminary operating costs. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission is contributing the equivalent of $5 million in the form of research and development work toward the completion of this project.

Third. The Shippingport Atomic Power Station, the country's first large-scale nuclear power station, was constructed as part of the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor development program. It is jointly owned by the AEC and the Duquesne Light Co. Shippingport was designed to function both as a test facility and as a power producer. Hence a large amount of instrumentation for the conduct of tests was incorporated in the plant's original design. Construction of the station was initiated in September 1954, and completed the latter part of 1957. Criticality was achieved on December 2, 1957, and on December 23, 1957, 60,000 kilowatts were attained. Over 600 million kilowatt-hours have been generated through November 30, 1960.

During 1960, as was the case during the previous years of the station's operation, extensive valuable information was obtained on uranium oxide fuel element performance, core reactivity changes and associated control problems, and the technical problems associated with operation and maintenance of nuclear powerplant systems and equipment, including health physics, radiochemistry, and waste disposal problems. More than 350 different tests have been performed, some of them more than once, resulting in a total number of tests in excess of 600.

In addition to its use as a test facility and power producer, Shippingport for several years has been used as a training facility for supervisors and technical personnel of other nuclear power stations, both in the United States and in other countries. The course provided has been formal in nature and covers, in detail, the operation at Shippingport.

Several years ago in keeping with Shippingport's role as a project producing data of value to all concerned with atomic power, information on the operation of Shippingport has been made available on a current basis to the electric utility industry in the form of monthly operating reports and, early in 1960, a book was published on the "Shippingport Operations—From Start-Up to First Refueling, December 1957 to 1959."

On October 9, 1959, Shippingport was shut down preparatory to beginning the first refueling operation—replacement of the enriched uranium element in core No. 1. Following this refueling, the station was returned to active service on May 6, 1960, and testing and training were resumed.

Fourth. The Vallecitos atomic powerplant in California, a joint project of General Electric Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co., was started in 1956. It was completed and began feeding electricity into Pacific Gas & Electric Co. lines the latter part of 1957. It operated through 1958 and 1959, and generated over 25 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. Late in 1959 the plant was shut down for an extensive modification program designed to permit increased power output from the reactor. All reactor internals were removed and a new high-density core installed. Additional pumps were provided and the turbine was overhauled. The reconstruction was completed in the fall of 1960 and the plant is now undergoing an extensive testing program prior to being restored to full power operation.

Fifth. The Santa Susana plant—the sodium reactor experiment—is a part of the AEC's reactor development program. It was designed, constructed, and is being operated for the AEC by Atomics International. The reactor facilities which are operated for the AEC by Atomics International have been out of service for cleanup, refueling, and modifications from July of 1959 until September of 1960.

Since going critical on its second core loading, the reactor has been operated at very low power for the purpose of conducting the usual new core type of physics measurements. Consequently the steam-electric portion of the plant has been out of service for the entire past year. It is presently scheduled to resume operation shortly.

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Sixth. Construction of Consolidated Edison Co.'s 275,000 kilowatt Indian Point nuclear powerplant is nearing completion. At the end of 1960 approximately 90 percent of the construction work at the site was completed. The cost of the plant is estimated at $100 million not including research and development or the cost of the first core. Construction work will be complete in mid-1961 and the plant is scheduled for operation in the fall of 1961.

Seventh. The Pathfinder project is a joint undertaking of Northern States Power Co. and Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates. In 1957, a contract was signed with the AEC to cover research and development assistance for this project under the third round of the power demonstration reactor program. This contract was modified in 1959 to include work on an internal nuclear superheater for the Pathfinder reactor. The construction permit for the plant was issued on May 12, 1960. Site construction work is 40 percent complete for the plant which is located on the Big Sioux River about 5 miles northeast of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The preconstruction research and development program is reaching completion and equipment manufacture is well underway with the plant scheduled to be in operation in 1962. Northern States Power Co. will own and operate the 66,000-kilowatt plant which is expected to cost a total of about $33 million including research and development work. The CUAPA organization is contributing $3.65 million for research and development work with the AEC contributing $10.3 million for research, development, and waiver of fuel use charges.

Eighth. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has completed the development program and is now constructing a 60,000-kilowatt advanced boiling water reactor near Eureka, Calif. This project, scheduled for criticality in the summer of 1962, is being financed entirely with investor funds, including research and development. Bechtel Corp. is designing and constructing the plant on a regular commercial basis. General Electric Co. is supplying the nuclear and electrical equipment. The total cost of the plant is now estimated to be $21 million. Escalation has added $1 million to its cost since it was authorized in 1958. During the past year the development program on pressure suppression containment which cost P.G. & E. about $400,000 was brought to a successful conclusion. Exclusive of this program and related costs, the pressure suppression design is estimated to cost approximately $650,000 less than conventional containment. This unique containment design is believed to be a significant advance in the

art. With it, in the event of an operating accident, escaping steam from the primary system would be quenched in a water pool, thereby limiting pressure rise. The construction permit incorporating this feature was granted by the AEC on November 9, 1960.

Ninth. The Enrico Fermi atomic powerplant is sponsored by the Power Reactor Development Co. and the Detroit Edison Co. Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., is performing research and development and furnishing the reactor design for the project. In addition, APDA will assist in the nuclear testing of the reactor. Major construction began in August of 1956 and the entire plant was essentially complete by the end of 1960.

As of January 1, 1961, the general contractor had about completed its assignment with only personnel on the site for minor installation work and closing out the accounts. All subcontractors, except two, also had completed their work. The plant operating force had assumed control of the project and, together with APDA, were engaged in extensive nonnuclear testing. Fueling of the reactor could begin on farily short notice but must await a final decision of the U.S. Supreme Court concerning licensing problems now before it, and the issuance of an operating license by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Cost of this plant to the utility organizations concerned is expected to be $84,250,000. The AEC is contributing the equivalent of $4,450,000 toward this project, being constructed as part of the AEC first round power demonstration program, in the form of research and development work.

Tenth. The Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc., formed in 1956, made a proposal to the AEC in August of 1957 under the third round of the power demonstration reactor program for the development and construction of a heavy water moderated and cooled pressure tube reactor nuclear steam generator. The proposal was accepted as a basis for constructural arrangements by the AEC in May 1958. In January of 1959, a contract with the AEC covering the project was executed and a contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. covering research and development work required for the project was completed in June of 1959.

The proposed plant having a design capacity of 17,000 kilowatts—net electrical—is scheduled for completion in 1962 and will be constructed on a site located at Parr, S.C., but changes in proposal may cause some stoppage. The associates under the proposed agreement would pay estimated capital cost of about $22 million. The cost of operating the plant will bring the total CVNPA expenditure to about $29 million. Total estimated cost to the AEC would be about $15 million. A construction permit for the project was granted in May 1960.

As of January 1, 1961, the plant was about 7½ percent complete. The foundation work is about one-third completed and over half of the structural steel has been erected. The vapor container is almost half finished.

Eleventh. A construction permit for the Saxton project was received from the AEC on February 11, 1960. Excavation for the containment vessel was started the week of February 8, 1960. Containment vessel erection was started June 28, 1960, and was completed September 30, 1960. The concrete foundation under the containment vessel has been completed and the concrete work inside the containment vessel is approximately 75 percent completed. The walls of the two-story control and auxiliary building have been completed and the steel joists for the second floor and roof have been erected. Roof slabs have been installed, but the floors have not been poured. Excavation for the waste treatment plant has been completed and concrete form work has been started.

All major equipment has been ordered and the pressure vessel is scheduled for delivery about now. Some of the smaller equipment such as pumps, valves, heat exchangers, and fans have started arriving at the site. The concrete work in the containment vessel is ready for the installation of equipment.

The concrete work in the waste treatment plant is approximately 35 percent completed. The floors and interior portions of the control and auxiliary building, and steelwork and foundation work in the existing power stations are also substantially completed and ready for the installation of equipment. The facility is now scheduled for construction to be essentially completed by August 1961, and for reactor criticality in November 1961.

Twelfth. A construction permit was issued to Consumers Power Co. on May 31, 1960. Construction work on the Big Rock Point plant began immediately on issuance of the permit and proceeded on schedule through 1960. Erection of the containment sphere and initial testing is complete. The other major structures on the plant site were enclosed to permit work to continue throughout the winter season. The project is on schedule for a target date of fuel loading by September 1962.

Contract negotiations between Consumers Power Co., the Atomic Energy Commission, Bechtel Corp., and General Electric Co. have been completed and all contracts have now been signed. Selection of the supervisory staff for the Big Rock Point plant is complete and a program of academic and practical work training was started in the summer of 1960. Work has begun on all of the necessary environmental studies, including hydrology, meteorology, and background radiation.

PLANTS UNDER DESIGN

Thirteenth. A research and development program directed to advancing the gas-cooled heavy-water moderated pressure-tube-type reactor is being conducted jointly by the Atomic Energy Commission, East Central Nuclear Group, and Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.

Fourteenth. In November 1958, and in response to an AEC invitation, a proposal was made by Philadelphia Electric Co. in cooperation with the nonprofit High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.—a 53-company association—to design, construct, and operate a prototype high-temperature, helium-cooled, graphite-moderated nuclear powerplant. The plant will be designed to be capable of producing 40,000 electrical kilowatts and will be located at Peach Bottom, Pa., on the Philadephia Electric Co.'s system in 1963. The original plan called for the initial core to be metal clad and the initial capacity to be about 28,000 kilowatts. The initial core will now be graphite clad and when the plant is completed in 1963 it should have full rated capacity with the first core. The plant is being constructed on a fixed-price contract for $24.5 million. In addition, AEC will contribute toward research and development performed by General Dynamics an amount not to exceed $14.5 million, including $2 million in postconstruction research and development. AEC will also waive up to $2.5 million in fuel use charges during research and the first 5 years of operation. Research, development, engineering, and layout work for the Peach Bottom project are progressing on schedule.

Some of the major conventional equipment has already been ordered and bids have been received on certain of the nuclear steam supply components. Application for a construction license has been filed and a hearing held with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. The advisory committee has requested additional information on the research and development program, which may delay the issuance of a construction license.

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Fifteenth. The Southern California Edison Co. has reached a preliminary understanding and is in the course of negotiating definitive agreements with Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Bechtel Corp. for the construction of a 375,000-kilowatt nuclear reactor plant at an estimated cost of $78 million. Construction of the project is dependent upon completion of the negotiation of such agreements, the negotiation with the AEC of contracts covering research and development and waiver of fuel-use charges, and the acquisition of a satisfactory plant site.

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS PLANNING STAGES

Sixteenth. A large-scale nuclear powerplant has been authorized for construction by the board of directors of New England Electric System. There is no material change in the status of this project since a year ago. The date for completion and the type have not yet been decided, but it is planned to be of the order of 200,000 to 300,000 kilowatts—electric—for operation not before 1966. Fossil fuel prices continue at a low level compared with 3 years ago. Installation of larger conventional units at Salem Harbor and at the new Brayton Point plant, the latter with two units scheduled, one each for 1963 and 1964, has deferred somewhat the original timetable for the New England Electric System reactor.

This plant must, of course, take its place in the orderly development of the future power supply program for the system. It is conceived as a production

plant, not an experiment or prototype. In view of the proposed completion date, the system has as yet no necessity to freeze on the reactor's precise type or design, and can continue to analyze and take into account continuing developments in reactor operations and design.

Seventeenth. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is studying manufacturers' proposals for a large-scale reactor. Efforts will continue to be given to the project until a satisfactory conclusion is reached. The utility is hopeful that a decision on the matter can be made in the next few months. A powerplant site suitable for a large nuclear powerplant has been acquired.

As far as I know, no other nation has a nuclear power developmental program as comprehensive as that of the United States and in which private enterprise has played such a large role. We have utility size power reactors in operation to give us necessary operating and maintenance experience and at the same time a broad diversified developmental program stressing research and prototype reactor construction. Time has indicated that such an approach is sound and that improvement in technology and not kilowatts is the essential ingredient for the ultimate success of our Nation's program.

TABLE I.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development*

PLANTS IN OPERATION

Name of participating utility companies and plants [1]	Type of reactor	Electrical capacity of plant (killowatts electric)	Owner of reactor	Operator of reactor	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation
(1) Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden).[2]	Boiling water-dual cycle	[3] 180,000	Commonwealth Edison Co.	Commonwealth Edison Co.	[4] $36,300,000	August 1960.
(2) Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee).	Pressurized water	[3] 136,000	Yankee	Yankee	[5] 57,000,000	1961.[6]
(3) Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).	do	[3] [7] 60,000	Atomic Energy Commission.	Duquesne Light Co.	[5] 25,149,000	December 1957.
(4) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).	Boiling water—Prototype for Dresden unit.	5,000	General Electric Co.	General Electric Co.	[5] 572,000	October 1957.
(5) Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).	Sodium graphite	7,500	Atomic Energy Commission.	Atomics International	[5] 1,697,000	July 1957.

PLANTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Name of organization and plant [1]	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(6) Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).	Pressurized water-thorium-uranium converter	275,000	Indian Point, N.Y.	$100,000,000	1961
(7) Northern States Power Co-Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates (Pathfinder).	Boiling water with internal nuclear superheater	66,000	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	22,800,000	1962
(8) Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay)	Advanced boiling water	60,000	Eureka, Calif.	21,000,000	1962
(9) PRDC-Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Fermi)	Fast breeder	100,000	Monroe, Mich.	84,250,000	1961
(10) Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates (Parr Shoals).	Pressurized water-pressure tube, heavy water moderated.	[3] 17,000	Parr, S.C.	29,000,000	1962
(11) Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp.	Water type	5,000	Saxton, Pa.	8,520,000	1961
(12) Consumers Power Co.	Boiling water, high power density	50,000	Big Rock Point, Mich.	30,000,000	1962

PLANTS UNDER DESIGN

Name of organization and plant [1]	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(13) East Central Nuclear Group-Florida West Coast Nuclear Group.	Gas cooled, heavy water moderated	50,000	Florida west coast	$34,898,000	1965
(14) Philadelphia Electric Co. High Temperature Reactor Development Association, Inc.	High temperature, helium cooled, graphite moderated.	40,000	Peach Bottom, Pa.	24,500,000	1963

PLANTS UNDER CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Name of organization	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(15) Southern California Edison Co.	Pressurized water	[10] 375,000	California	$78,000,000	1965

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS PLANNING STAGES

Name of organization	Type of reactor	Capacity of plant (kilowatts electric)	Location	Estimated cost to utility organization	In operation by
(16) New England Electric System	Not yet selected	200,000 to 300,000	New England		1966-67
(17) Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Light water	300,000 or larger	California	[11] $60,000,000	1964-65

[1] See table III for utility company members of respective groups.
[2] Research and development expenditures of $15,000,000 were paid by Nuclear Power Group, Inc.
[3] Net.
[4] Exclusive of research and development expenditures paid by Nuclear Power Group, Inc.
[5] Final costs are expected to amount to less than the estimate.
[6] Critical Aug. 19, 1960, commercial operation 1961.
[7] Initial net capacity, ultimate of 100,000 kilowatts gross expected.
[8] Includes $20,150,000 for the conventional portion of the plant and the site, and $5,000,000 toward cost of reactor.
[9] For turbogenerator portion.
[10] Gross.
[11] Approximate.

TABLE II.—*Electric utility company participation in nuclear power development with estimate of expenditures by electric utility companies for nuclear power development* [1]

	1956 and earlier	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Expenditures for plants [2]	36,908,000	34,777,000	50,621,000	99,535,000	107,348,000	79,266,000	41,736,500
Other expenditures [3]	3,598,000	2,648,000	4,379,000	2,603,000	3,766,000	5,807,500	4,952,000
Total by years	40,506,000	37,425,000	55,000,000	102,138,000	111,114,000	85,073,500	46,688,500
Cumulative	40,506,000	77,931,000	132,931,000	235,069,000	346,183,000	431,257,000	477,945,000

[1] Based on information obtained from the major nuclear power groups and previous surveys made by Edison Electric Institute.

[2] Estimate of expenditures by electric utility organizations for the following plants in operation, under construction or contract, including accompanying research and development work, but exclusive of operating costs.

Dresden.
Yankee.
Shippingport.
Vallecitos.
Santa Susana.
Indian Point.
Pathfinder.
Humboldt Bay.
Enrico Fermi.
Parr Shoals.
Saxton.
Big Rock Point.
ECNG–FWCNG project.
Peach Bottom.

[3] Includes expenditures by individual companies and groups of companies for nuclear power study, research and development. These figures do not include expenditures associated with any of the projects listed in (2) above. Included in this category are the following groups:

Empire State Atomic Development Associates.
Texas Atomic Energy Research Associates.
Southwest Atomic Energy Associates.
Nuclear Power Group.
Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group.
Atomic Power Engineering Group (up to 1959).
Pacific Northwest Power Co. Group.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. project (up to time of cancellation).
Pioneer Service & Engineering Group.

TABLE III

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY PARTICIPATION IN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Names of electric utility companies participating in nuclear power study, research, development, operating, and construction projects

Projects in Operation

1. Commonwealth Edison Co. (Dresden)—Nuclear Power Group: American Electric Power Service Corp., Central Illinois Light Co., Commonwealth Edison Co., Illinois Power Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Union Electric Co.

2. Yankee Atomic Electric Co. (Yankee): Boston Edison Co., Central Maine Power Co., Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Eastern Utilities Associates, Hartford Electric Light Co., New England Electric System, New England Gas & Electric Association, Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, Western Massachusetts Electric Co.

3. Duquesne Light Co. (Shippingport).

4. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Vallecitos).

5. Southern California Edison Co. (Santa Susana).

Projects Under Construction

6. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (Indian Point).

7. Northern States Power Co. (Pathfinder)—Central Utilities Atomic Power Associates: Central Electric & Gas Co., Interstate Power Co., Iowa Power & Light Co., Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Madison Gas & Electric Co., Northern States Power Co., Northwestern Public Service Co., Otter Tail Power Co., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., Wisconsin Public Service Corp.

8. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (Humboldt Bay).

9. The Detroit Edison Co. (Enrico Fermi)—Power Reactor Development Co.: Alabama Power Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Mississippi Power Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

10. Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc. (Parr Shoals): Carolina Power & Light Co., Duke Power Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co.

11. Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp. (Saxton): Pennsylvania Electric Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co.

12. Consumers Power Co. (Big Rock Point).

Projects Under Design

13. East Central Nuclear Group—Florida West Coast Nuclear Group: Appalachian Power Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Dayton Power & Light Co., Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Monongahela Power Co., Ohio Edison Co., Ohio Power Co., Pennsylvania Power Co., Potomac Edison Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., West Penn Power Co., Florida Power Corp., Tampa Electric Co.

14. Philadelphia Electric Co. (Peach Bottom)—High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc.; Alabama Power Co., Arizona Public Service Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Atlantic City Electric Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., California Electric Power Co., Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., Central Illinois Light Co., Central Illinois Public Service Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Central Power & Light Co., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., Gulf Power Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., Idaho Power Co., Illinois Power Co., Iowa Public Service Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Kentucky Utilities Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., Montana Power Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Portland General Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., St. Joseph Light & Power Co., San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Sierra Pacific Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., United Illuminating Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

Projects in Contract Negotiations

15. Southern California Edison Co.

Projects in Various Planning Stages

16. New England Electric System.

17. Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Study, Research and Development Groups

18. Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Inc.: Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Long Island Lighting Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

19. Texas Atomic Energy Research Foundation: Central Power & Light Co., Community Public Service Co., Dallas Power & Light Co., El Paso Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Houston Lighting & Power Co., Southwestern Electric Power Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Texas Electric Service Co., Texas Power & Light Co., West Texas Utilities Co.

20. Southwest Atomic Energy Associates: Arkansas Power & Light Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., Empire District Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Kansas Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Electric Power Co., Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc.

21. Atomic Power Development Associates: Alabama Power Co., Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., Consumers Power Co., Delaware Power & Light Co., Detroit Edison Co., General Public Utilities Corp., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Hartford Electric & Light Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Long Island Lighting Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Mississippi Power Co., New Jersey Power & Light Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Pennsylvania Electric Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., Southern Services, Inc., Toledo Edison Co., Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Wisconsin Power & Light Co.

22. East Central Nuclear Group. (See item 13.)

23. Nuclear Power Group. (See item 1.)
24. Rocky Mountain-Pacific Nuclear Research Group: Arizona Public Service Co., California Electric Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland General Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Utah Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co.
25. San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

TABLE IV

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANY PARTICIPATION IN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Reactor types

1. Pressurized water reactors: Shippingport, Yankee, Indian Point, Saxton, Southern California Edison project.
2. Boiling water reactors: Big Rock Point, Vallecitos,[1] Dresden, Humboldt Bay, Pathfinder.
3. Fast sodium-cooled reactors: Fermi.
4. Thermal sodium-cooled reactors: Santa Susana.[1]
5. Gas-cooled reactors: Peach Bottom, ECNG–FWCNG.
6. Heavy water reactors: Parr Shoals.
7. Epithermal thorium reactors: Southwest Atomic Energy Associates.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to introduce a bill next Monday that would grant to the widow of an officer of the Foreign Service of the United States a pension of $2,400 upon the death of the husband.

Under the present law, a widow of a Foreign Service officer who died before August 29, 1954, is entitled to receive an annuity of $2,400 per annum, if she is not already receiving an annuity or is not entitled to the benefits of a widow under the Employees' Compensation Act.

This bill would include widows of Foreign Service officers who retired before August 29, 1954, and are not receiving any other annuity or benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. Foreign Service officers who died before August 29, 1954, could not provide for their widows by participating in the Federal group life insurance program. At present, Foreign Service officers who retired before August 29, 1954, could not provide for widows by participating in such a Government insurance program.

The widows in this latter group who are not entitled to receive these and other monetary benefits from the Federal Government will be entitled to receive this pension under this bill.

I do hope that the Members of the House will agree with me and pass this bill and provide for these widows.

[1] Have made capital contributions to and participated in the operations of the conventional equipment only.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes on Thursday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. KYL), for 30 minutes on Monday, March 6, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OLSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. KOWALSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes, p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 days after receipt. Accordingly, there are submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated reports of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank E. Smith:											
France	franc	325	65.00	350	70.00	720	145.00	100	20.00	1,500	300.00
Netherlands	guilder	300	75.00	300	75.00			120	30.00	720	180.00
Belgium	franc	800	16.00	900	18.00	2,500	50.00	800	16.00	5,000	100.00
England	pound	61	171.00	40	112.00	29	81.00	20	56.00	150	420.00
Germany	mark	200	50.00	240	60.00	360	90.00			800	200.00
Italy	lira	30,000	48.00	32,000	50.00	46,000	77.00	16,000	25.00	124,000	200.00
John A. Blatnik: Colombia	peso			363	53.00	719	105.00	288	42.00	1,370	200.00
Frank M. Clark: France	franc	1,154	235.00	605	123.00	110	22.00	90	18.00	1,958	398.00
Total			660.00		561.00		570.00		207.00		1,998.00

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,998.00

MAR. 1, 1961.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Walter Rogers:											
Denmark	kroner	332.90	48.25	189.00	27.45	43.00	6.25	33.10	4.70	598.00	86.65
India	rupee	186.37	39.14	200.00	42.00	170.00	35.70	43.63	9.16	600.00	126.00
Germany	deutsche mark	107.65	25.62	42.35	10.08	9,502.08	2,269.55	30.00	7.15	9,712.08	2,312.40
Lebanon	pound	82.85	26.07	125.00	39.32	36.00	11.32	23.65	7.44	267.50	84.15
Jordan	dinar	1.760	4.93	2.600	7.28	.700	1.96	1.190	3.33	6.250	17.50
Greece	drachma	647.00	19.41	613.00	18.39	300.00	9.00	440.00	13.20	2,000.00	60.00
Leo W. O'Brien:											
New Zealand	pound			4	11.00			6	16.70	10	27.70
Australia	do	13.6.10	29.96					10	22.50	23.6	52.88
Hong Kong	dollar	136.80	24.00	125.40	22.00			194.70	34.00	460.00	80.00
Japan	yen	15,300	42.50	19,500	54.00			12,000	33.30	46,800	129.80
Denmark	kroner	203	31.00	318.5	49.00			234	36.00	755.5	116.00
England	pound	11.4.7	31.00	16	45.00			10	28.00	37.4.7	104.00
Germany	deutsche mark					12,925.50	3,077.50			12,925.50	3,077.50
Robert W. Hemphill:											
New Zealand	pound	13.14.6	38.50	4.10	11.56	1.2	3.08	5.6	14.84	23.34.6	67.98
Australia	do	8.4.6	18.50	4.12.6	10.40	2.0.0	4.50	2.3.0	4.85	17.0.0	38.25
Hong Kong	dollar	133.95	23.50	142.50	25.00	98.85	17.34	186.10	32.65	561.40	98.49
Japan	yen	23,265	64.62	10,015	27.80	10,000	27.77	2,915	8.06	46,180	128.25
Denmark	kroner	311	44.75	385	55.44			70.75	10.15	766.75	110.34
Norway	do	267	37.57					4.60	.63	271.60	38.20
England	pound	35.10.9	99.50	18.4.0	50.96	14.6.2	40.10	11.13.10	33.00	79.13.21	223.56
Scotland	do	11.8.0	32.00	5.5.0	14.70	3.0.2	7.64	4.12.0	12.88	24.5	67.15
Germany	deutsche mark					12,206.25	2,906.25			12,206.25	2,906.25
Milton W. Glenn:											
United Kingdom	pound	118.0.0	330.40	72.0.0	201.60			10.0.0	28.00	200	560.00
Netherlands	gilder					3,891.20	1,032.15			3,891.20	1,032.15
Dan Rostenkowski:											
Japan	yen	21,600	60.00	16,200	45.00	5,000	13.89	16,200	45.00	59,000	163.89
Denmark	kroner	310.34	45.00	241.38	35.00	85.18	12.35	193.10	28.00	830.00	120.35
United Kingdom	pound	26.78	75.00	17.11	48.00	6.21	11.60	8.9	25.00	57.00	159.60
Netherlands	gilder					7,807.86	2,054.70			7,807.86	2,054.70
M. W. Cunningham:											
Denmark	kroner	555.20	80.70	787.50	114.45	80.00	11.63	257.30	37.40	1,690	244.18
India	rupee	187.78	39.40	290.00	60.90	35.00	7.35	197.22	41.45	710	149.10
Lebanon	pound	96.85	30.46	71.50	22.50			38.25	12.02	206.60	64.98
Jordan	dinar	1.76	4.93	1.90	5.32	1.10	3.00	1.49	4.25	6.25	17.50
Greece	drachma	630	18.90	455	13.65			415	12.45	1,500	45.00
Germany	deutsche mark	80.50	19.17	76.20	16.10	8,661.66	2,062.30	49.90	11.88	8,868.36	2,109.45
United Kingdom	pound	28.6.0	79.25	35.10.0	99.40	5.18.0	16.50	11.16.0	33.05	81.10.0	228.20
Total			1,464.18		1,183.30		13,643.43		611.04		16,902.15

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. $ equivalent)	$16,902.15

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

MAR. 2, 1961.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

619. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1960, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended, July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

620. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

621. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending deportation in the case of Wong Way June, [redacted], pursuant to section 244(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, (8 U.S.C. 1254 (a)(4); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

622. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending deportation in the case of Harold Newton, [redacted], pursuant to section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

623. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the staff report summary of activities for 1960, Office of Saline Water, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

624. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting a report dealing with the coordination of State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

625. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting correspondence relating to comments on the General Accounting Office report on an examination of the agency's section 1311 report of appropriations and funds under its control as of June 30, 1959 (B-114876, dated August 4, 1960); to the Committee on Appropriations.

626. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 49. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2204. A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5144. A bill to provide for the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5145. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 5146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5147. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce", approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5148. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5149. A bill to amend subdivision (d) of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 5150. A bill to correct certain inequities in the computation of service for retirement purposes for members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 5152. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that social security benefits, other annuities, and up to $10,000 in payments under policies of life insurance shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 5155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 5156. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 5158. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.15 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5159. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to encourage travel to the United States by foreign nationals by authorizing the Secretary of State to liberalize visa requirements for nonimmigrant visitors to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 5160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of stimulating economic growth and activity, providing additional jobs for the growing labor force, and permitting the replacement of obsolete and inefficient machinery and equipment by the allowance of reinvestment depreciation deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5162. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5163. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 5164. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 5165. A bill to provide for the payment of individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5166. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that under certain circumstances gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5167. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5168. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5170. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce a woman's benefits in certain cases where she becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5171. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 5172. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5173. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 204. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide compensating payments for tax exemptions granted in Maryland to members of the diplomatic corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the

electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider granting an extension of the stamp (food) plan pilot projects to include the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 5174. A bill to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 5175. A bill to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 5176. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5177. A bill for the relief of Constantin Papadikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 5178. A bill for the relief of Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5179. A bill for the relief of the U.S. Display Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5180. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend Private Law 85–699; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5182. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Redick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 5183. A bill for the relief of Michaelangelo Mariano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5184. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Szprejda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Rosea Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend Private Law 85–699; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Frank Muzzi and his wife, Maria Primarano Muzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the humanitarian works of Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

75. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jay Creswell, Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it will be my privilege, tomorrow, to speak to the people of Bulgaria through the Voice of America. March 3 commemorates for the Bulgarian people a birth of freedom. On that day 83 years ago, a proud country finally regained the independence it had lost several centuries before.

I will tell these people that in the modern history of the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, there has been a continual record of subjugation. This ugly record finally was broken late in the 19th century. Siding with the victorious Russians in the Russo-Turkish War, Bulgaria was able to obtain its independence. By the Treaty of San Stefano, Bulgaria's freedom was guaranteed. Thus, the Bulgarians after over five centuries of foreign domination were finally liberated by the Russians.

It is one of the sad ironies of history that today Russia, under Communist rule, dominates Bulgaria. After suffering the miseries of two World Wars Bulgaria still is not free. As a result of the Second World War she lost her freedom in the peace that followed to the very country which claimed to have liberated her.

It is within the context of the modern plight of Bulgaria that March 3 looms so large upon the horizon as a symbol of freedom. Today in Bulgaria there is no more liberty than under Turkish rule, and it is tragic that even in a country so desirous of freedom it cannot exist. Let us all pray that the brave Bulgarian people will soon be able to realize their heritage of freedom that we today are commemorating.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of Bulgaria and to Americans of Bulgarian descent on the 83d anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria from the yoke of the decaying Ottoman Empire. On March 3, 1878, the Treaty of San Stefano between imperial Russia and Ottoman Turkey reestablished the Bulgarian nation after 500 years of foreign oppression. Although the frontiers of the new nation were narrowed by the subsequent Congress of Berlin, the modern Bulgarian nation then came into existence. The liberation of Bulgaria followed a long struggle by gallant patriots, which won the sympathy and support of the free nations of the West, led by the great British Prime Minister William Gladstone.

A freely elected national assembly adopted the democratic Tirnovo Constitution over the opposition of czarist Russia. This democratic constitution was finally destroyed by the Communist satellite regime which was imposed on Bulgaria at the end of World War II.

From the time of their liberation from Turkish rule to the present day, the Bulgarian people have resisted the aggressive pressures of Russian imperialism, both czarist and Communist. At the end of World War II a Communist satellite regime was imposed on Bulgaria by the Red army. The Soviet Union violated its solemn promise in Bulgaria as it did all throughout Eastern Europe and permitted no free elections to be held. The Bulgarian people, like all of the subjugated peoples of the Soviet Empire, retain their hope and faith in ultimate liberation.

The Bulgarian National Front of America, which represents the patriotic younger generation in Bulgarian politics, has since 1954 organized solemn observations of Bulgarian Liberation Day in America.

It is eminently fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we in this body join with our fellow Americans of Bulgarian descent, with the Bulgarian people who bear the yoke of an alien totalitarianism, and with all freemen in commemorating the day of Bulgarian liberation from Ottoman tyranny and in expressing the hope that the day of Bulgarian liberation from Communist tyranny will not be long delayed.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, with so many peoples of the world fighting against the yoke of oppression, it is most appropriate that we mark Bulgarian Liberation Day.

It was 83 years ago today that the act of San Stefano restored independence to the Bulgarian nation after centuries of foreign domination.

Against the wishes of her people, Bulgaria has been a satellite nation since 1944. Yet within her borders the hope of the restoration of full national sovereignty has been kept burning brightly.

On this liberation day, the Bulgarian people, and the sons and daughters of Bulgaria all over the world, will join in prayer that soon will come the glorious day when Bulgaria is again a free nation.

Bulgarian Liberation Day, March 3, 1878

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians are the most resourceful and defiant fighters against all their enemies, but they are perhaps best known as gallant warriors against their oppressors.

Their little country in the Balkans was a powerful kingdom during the middle ages, and they constituted a real power there for centuries. Then early in the 15th century as the Ottoman Turks overran the Balkan Peninsula and parts of southern Europe, Bulgaria became an Ottoman province in the Ottoman Empire, and the Bulgarians a resolute minority struggling against Ottoman despotism. For more than 400 years they carried on their struggle against formidable odds, and all these attempts ended in failure because without effective outside help they could not cope with the then powerful Ottoman forces.

In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 they had their chance. The Bulgarians were fighting on the side of the Russians, for the war was waged in the name of the Balkan peoples. Early in 1878 the Turks were thoroughly vanquished, and when Russia was dictating her peace terms, she insisted upon Bulgarian freedom. Thus their freedom was guaranteed in the treaty signed on March 3, 1878, and since then Bulgarians everywhere, in and out of their homeland, think of that day as their holiday and celebrate it as such. Since those days the Bulgarian people have endured much misery, have gone through two devastating World Wars, and both of these have had tragic consequences for them. Today, after all the sufferings and sacrifices, they are not free in their homeland. Even so, these stanch fighters for freedom, these dauntless and hardy peasants, under the most oppressive of tyrannies continue to work and hope for their eventual freedom. There under Communist totalitarianism, and totally sealed off from the free world, they work for their ruthless taskmasters, yet cling to their most cherished ideal, their freedom and independence. It is sad but true that while they attained their freedom with the aid of czarist Russian forces 83 years ago, today they are robbed of their freedom in their homeland by Communist Russian agents. All friends of freedom-hungry Bulgarian people hope that they will again regain their freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

Area Redevelopment: A Must in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that on February 27, 1959, I submitted testimony to the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in support of area redevelopment legislation. Two years later—in fact, to the day—on February 27, I was scheduled to appear before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Banking and Currency Committee—again in support of this legislation. Unfortunately, I was unable to personally testify on this long overdue program because of a recent illness. However, I was given the privilege of submitting a statement to the subcommittee. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will see fit to preserve for all of the Nation's citizens opportunity and human dignity by enacting area redevelopment legislation. My statement to the subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with much regret that a recent illness prevented my personally appearing before your subcommittee last Monday, February 27, in support of the area redevelopment bill. However, I appreciate having the opportunity of submitting a statement in support of this much needed program.

Since the 84th Congress I have been exerting every effort toward the support of legislation to provide extended Federal assistance to depressed areas. I refuse to become discouraged because of past Presidential vetoes of bills which, in my opinion, were desperately needed to protect this Nation's great human resources. Again this year, as in the past, I am prepared to fight with all my God-given strength to see the Area Redevelopment Act born to reality.

It is with honor and privilege that I represent the people of the 14th District of Michigan. I am entering my 25th year of service—and through this quarter of a century I have been a part of their efforts to build a finer community and to respond to the call of our Nation through wars and national emergencies. This time, it is my district which needs the response and support of its mother Nation—for this day thousands, yes, 165,000 citizens of this great city of Detroit, cannot find gainful employment, cannot support their families, and they are begging for an honest day's work. But these people have been pushed off that magical path of opportunity through no fault of their own.

This is not a peculiar situation happening only to Detroit or to just one industrial center, but one that is like a growing cancer which has spread to communities large and small—industrial and agricultural—throughout our Nation; and, if not treated now, it can eat its way into our economic backbone and produce irreparable damage to our national strength.

These communities and their States have tried desperately to fight this curse of unemployment. They have cried time and time again for help through their legislative representatives. The Congress responded twice—only to have been answered by Executive vetoes.

Mr. Chairman, we must renew our fight. We must muster all the strength of this legislative body which speaks for the people. We must provide the laws necessary to recapture the vitality of our national economy and give to the people of our Nation a program providing the methods to enable our distressed areas to achieve lasting improvement and to enhance their domestic prosperity by establishing stable and diversified local economies. This legislation will give us strength not only at home but will, indeed, prove to the world we are still one nation under God striving to preserve for all its citizens opportunity and human dignity.

On behalf of the 165,000 unemployed in Detroit and hundreds of thousands in other depressed areas, I urge the committee to favorably consider the area redevelopment bill and to report it at the earliest possible moment.

Thank you.

The 4–H Club Members Serve America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National 4–H Club Week will be celebrated this year from March 4 to the 11. The nearly 2⅓ million members of this national youth organization are indeed worthy of our recognition and encouragement for by their participation in 4–H Club activities now they are preparing themselves to be responsible, well-trained citizens of tomorrow.

From an inauspicious beginning around the turn of the century, the extensive system of 4–H Clubs now encircles the globe and more than 40 countries have adopted all or part of the plan. This phenomenal growth is due not only to the appeal of the 4–H Club program but also to the fine guidance of three major groups who lead as a team to carry on national 4–H Club activities: The Cooperative Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State land-grant colleges and universities, the National 4–H Club Foundation, and the National 4–H Service Committee. These groups join together in their common endeavor to assist 4–H members to make the most of their abilities, to utilize scientific advances in farming and homemaking, and to render more efficient service to their community, State, and Nation.

At the local level, direction and instruction are provided by county agents, home demonstration agents, parents, businessmen, teachers, and older 4–H'ers who give generously of their time and

talents to insure the success of 4–H Club work. In the Second District of Kentucky and in Kentucky generally we are fortunate in having many such outstanding men and women whose efforts are apparent in the impressive success of the 4–H program in Kentucky. They deserve our wholehearted gratitude for working for a better America through the youth of our Nation. Only through an informed citizenry, directed by high moral values and a sense of responsibility, can we rightfully assume the leadership of the free world.

The continuing theme of National 4–H Club Week is "Learn, Live, Serve Through 4–H," and I believe it clearly expresses the high purposes to which these young people are dedicated. Through their 4–H Club work, boys and girls learn better ways to farm, prepare food, make clothing and numerous other skills which will be of assistance to them in later life.

The 4–H Club members strive to live each day in a manner which will reflect credit upon themselves, their families, and their organization. Individual perfection in their intellectual and moral life as expressed in the 4–H Club motto "make the best better" is also stressed.

Perhaps the most important word of the theme is "Serve," because it is through service that these young people put into practice the training they have received in their 4–H Club projects. Not only do their families, communities, and States benefit from their knowledge, but they are made aware of the satisfaction and joy resulting from service to one's fellow man. This willingness to serve will carry over into the future and they will become the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to commend all present members of the 4–H Clubs in Kentucky on their outstanding achievements, and to thank the many men and women in my section of the State who are contributing so much in time, energy, and enthusiasm to this fine youth organization.

A Letter to the President of the United States—Protest Against Increase in Residual Fuel Oil Import Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it would take some real national eye shutting to ignore the ignominious effects which importations of foreign residual fuel oil have upon the economies of our coal-producing States. Fortunately, our new and excellent Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Stewart L. Udall, is wide awake to this situation, and conducted a lengthy and grueling hearing on the matter on February 20.

Nor is President John F. Kennedy uninformed as to the serious economic decline which foreign residual oil imports have caused in many areas of our coal-producing States. But to strengthen his hand in forging an equitable solution to this most inequitable matter, I sent him a letter dated February 27, 1961, which 17 of my senatorial colleagues cosigned.

This letter contains many of the pertinent facts regarding the situation, and I believe that other Members of the Congress who are interested in the security of our Nation, as well as in the economic well-being of our depressed areas, should have the opportunity to read this letter. For this reason, I ask for unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you have clearly proclaimed, the deterioration of markets, decline of job opportunities, and economic distress throughout the coal-producing regions of America are intolerable and dangerous to our very security. The Members of the Congress of the United States representing these many areas, the welfare and prosperity of these regions, the Nation's coal producers, members of the United Mine Workers of America, operators and employees of the coal-hauling railroads, and others so vitally concerned are solidly determined that such conditions must be corrected. We, therefore, wish to present for your attention facts regarding the injurious effects upon the coal and rail industries resulting from increasing imports of residual fuel oil.

In February 1955, there was issued a report prepared by an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President on July 30, 1954. In part, the report contained the following:

"An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in free countries which help to supply the U.S. market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

We maintain that the coal industry does not today enjoy a level of operation which would make possible rapid expansion in the event of a national emergency. Residual oil imports, having risen from 53 million barrels in 1948 to 230 million in 1960, have made dangerous inroads into coal's east coast markets.

The 1960 imports of residual oil were the equivalent of approximately 55 million tons of bituminous coal. About 75 percent of the oil which is imported is competitive with coal. Therefore, this competitive element last year displaced 41,250,000 tons of coal. The average value per ton of bituminous coal, F.O.B. mines, being around $4.86 (1959 figure), the loss of a market for 41¼ million tons of coal meant a loss of $200,475,000 in gross revenues for coal producers. This meant a loss of $100 million in miners' wages, or a year's work for nearly 20,000 men. It meant a loss of $100 million in new equipment, taxes, development of new mines, and return on investment. Additionally, the railroads lost well over $100 million in lost freight revenues, to say nothing of the wages lost to railroad workers. One could further cite the loss in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments.

It is doubtful that any other major industry, vital to the economy of the Nation, has experienced anything approaching the depressed financial condition of the coal mining industry over the past 20 years. In 1953, producers who accounted for 80 percent of the coal mined realized a calculated net profit of less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the gross value of the coal produced. It is not difficult to see, therefore, that the coal industry is in a precarious financial situation, and it simply does not have the resources to engage in research, to purchase high priced equipment for use in the highly competitive fuel field, and to maintain the cost upkeep of machinery and operative mines ready to expand production in a moment of emergency.

Moreover, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in a day of peril. As the number of personnel regularly employed in the mines has been sharply reduced, there has been a steady reduction in the relative number of younger men employed in the coal industry. In 1951 the percentage of miners under 30 years of age was 18.6. In 1957 it had fallen to 6.5 percent. This alarming trend emphasizes the importance of retaining young workers in the bituminous coal industry in order to assure an adequate supply of experienced and skilled workers in the event of war.

With reduced coal freight tonnage, 25 percent of the rolling stock of the B. & O. Railroad is presently in need of repairs, and the situation is equally bad with other railroads. Railroad workers have been laid off, railroads are not buying new cars as fast as old ones are headed for the scrap heap, and this great medium of transportation would find it difficult to respond to the requirements which must be met in an hour of national peril.

The domestic oil industry has suffered as a result of increased foreign imports, because domestic exploration and production are discouraged. Meanwhile, the great industrial plants on the east coast have become increasingly dependent upon foreign residual oil. It may be noted that the foreign sources which supplied but 26 percent of the east coast residual oil requirements in 1940, now account for something in excess of 70 percent of the residual oil requirements of the same area. If war should come, the foreign sources which supply these requirements would become utterly undependable. To be reminded of this, one has only to read pages 87 and 88 of the Interior Department's "History of Petroleum Administration for War, 1941–45." That document, in referring to the sinking of 50 tankers along the east coast in 1942 and the resulting fuel supply situation, has this to say:

"Although the boats had to keep running to supply military requirements, no one could doubt the decline of tanker shipments for civilian needs in the face of those 50 sinkings. From then on, until the last year of the war, tanker deliveries were an insignificant factor in supplying the oil needs of the east coast."

It is obvious, in the light of the foregoing, that to permit increasing quantities of residual fuel oil to be imported into this country is to invite economic disaster in the coal, domestic oil, and railroad industries in time of uneasy peace and to invite military disaster to the country in time of war.

We appreciate that you are quite familiar with the fact that the ordinary home does

not use residual oil for heating purposes. Most of it goes into industry, because special equipment is required for preheating purposes. While U.S. refineries are very advanced and efficient, the residual fuel oil yield in South American refineries may be as high as 60 percent. In order to dispose of residual oil, the oil companies are willing to sell it at almost any price, and it is dumped on utility and large steam plants that have multiple burning equipment. They provide the focal point for the residual-coal competition when there are excess supplies of residual oil caused by imports. Consequently, there is no stability of price, and the objective is to "undersell" coal at any price. This type of competition is unconscionable and simply cannot be met by the coal industry. The results are closed mines, unemployed men walking the streets looking for work, and families with no food other than Government surplus commodities.

We, the undersigned, do not ask for complete elimination of residual fuel oil imports. This would be unreasonable and unthinkable. But we do ask for a substantial reduction. We maintain that the quotas on residual oil imports should be so designed to permit the coal industry, the domestic oil industry, and the transportation industry to meet the needs of exploration and research, repair and replace damaged and obsolete equipment, recoup employment losses, and maintain a capability to meet the expanded needs of a national emergency. We believe that it is unwise to permit residual imports in any year to rise above 1957 levels, and we hope that a thorough reevaluation of the residual oil import quota program will reveal the necessity for a gradual reduction of quota levels to a point where coal might be permitted to regain a part of its markets, at least, and the domestic oil industry may be encouraged to find new sources of supply so as to eliminate the necessity for our having to depend, in the event of war, on foreign sources which will likely be unable to produce and on tankers which will surely be unable to reach our shores.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, FRANK CARLSON, J. J. HICKEY, HOMER E. CAPEHART, GALE W. MCGEE, THRUSTON B. MORTON, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, VANCE HARTKE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, ERNEST GRUENING, E. L. BARTLETT, MILTON R. YOUNG, FRANK E. MOSS, QUENTIN N. BURDICK, U.S. Senators.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1961

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, on this fair day when the Chief Executive of the Republic has dedicated in the Nation's Capital a temple of conservation, a noble symbol of our vital resources, we lift our doxology for the good land which Thou hast given us. Roll upon our consciences, we pray, our responsibility as trustees who occupy this land for so brief a span.

Before Thee, the Lord of all the earth, we would regard our inheritance as holy ground—for the earth is Thine, and all that is therein—whose beauty is to be reverenced, whose forests are to be guarded, whose soil is to be preserved, whose primeval reaches and ranges are to be unspoiled, and whose wildlife is to be protected.

We are grateful that for our day Thou art raising up prophets like Nehemiah of old, who are crying to the despoilers of our national wealth, "Behold, we are the servants of that larger and opulent land Jehovah's great goodness hath given to our fathers."

Enable us to exercise our stewardship wisely and well for the sake of those whose distant feet we hear coming along the future's broadening way.

We ask this in the name of Him who in a wayside flower saw a glory surpassing the robes of royalty. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 2, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William A. McRae, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

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

Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

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

Frank Burton Ellis, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund; U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; and

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund; U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 163 officers for appointment to the grade of major general and brigadier general in the Regular Air Force and Air Force Reserve, as well as the nominations of 20 officers for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Naval Reserve. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

Leonard S. Bailey, and sundry other officers of the Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion;

Maj. Gen. William P. Farnsworth (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), U.S. Air Force, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve; and

Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I also report favorably a total of 1,848 nominations in the Regular Air Force for promotion to the grade of major. These names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Edwards Abrams, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.