

of the 11 point legislative program that I have introduced into the Congress—

Mr. SHUMAN. That's right.

Senator WILLIAMS. And with that support we are very grateful.

Let me deal with—

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Shuman, I don't think has had his full share of the time.

If there are some points you would like to make, Mr. Shuman—

Mr. SHUMAN. Yes, I would. I would like to make a very definite point that when you get Federal legislation, regulation, then you have to have administration; and in a country as large as the United States a federally administered program cannot take account of the extreme variation that there is from community to community and State to State. Furthermore you have the kind of thing, Senator, that we experienced with the former Secretary of Labor Mitchell who strained the interpretation I think of the legislation and certainly used rather dictatorial authorities to move into the farm labor field. I don't think that any of us believe that with increased Federal legislation we will have any more—any less of this approach to the solution to problems than we had with Secretary Mitchell.

We are going to have more of it because we'll have more administrators, more folks watching every community in the United States, huge cost to the Federal Government and slowing down progress to the rate of the slowest. That's what happens under Federal regulation, the minimum becomes the maximum. You transfer responsibilities from local people and local communities to the Federal Government and that's not a good direction to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this what happened when almost 30 years ago we enacted a minimum wage, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation—

Mr. SHUMAN. In my opinion—

Senator WILLIAMS. And limited workweek?

Mr. SHUMAN. It's my opinion that the laborers of the United States have been hurt more by the increased unemployment generated by the increase in minimum wages than they have been helped. I think the

competitive way is the way to improve conditions for not only labor but agriculture and all the rest.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I would think that most of the people in this country recognize that with those built-in security measures that we have enjoyed for 20 to 30 years, has come the new opportunity for the average American to enjoy some of the good things of life.

But we're not asking anything extravagant for the farm worker, all we are asking for is education for—for his youngsters, an opportunity to have—

Mr. SMITH. Gentlemen—

Senator WILLIAMS. Health care and welfare care—

Mr. SMITH. I'm sorry to interrupt but we have to have the summaries now.

Can Mr. Shuman give his summary statement—2 minutes.

Mr. SHUMAN. Actually I think that we have seen the essential elements of the disagreement here. We on the farms of the United States are just as interested and just as going to work just as hard to improve the conditions of these poor folks as anyone else. We have crops that still must be harvested by hand unfortunately, and we are—we're conscious of the fact that the way to solve the migrant labor problem is to do away with the kind of work that makes it possible. Federal legislation may in effect continue the migrant worker many, many years longer than he would be continued if we continue the way we have with research and emphasis on ways to eliminate the problem by eliminating the work.

Now, our basic belief is that the centralization of power in the central Government or Federal Government, power and authority, and encouragement of lack of responsibility by individual citizens is one of the greatest perils that we have to the future of our Republic and to our competitive enterprise system.

It has not been demonstrated that increased Federal responsibility improves the conditions for these people and this Federal legislation is an entering wedge to be

broadened out, it's really a part of the campaign on the part of the monopoly powers in labor to organize and control the food industries just as they are commencing to control the transportation industry.

Mr. SMITH. Excuse me, Mr. Shuman, I'm sorry your time is up.

Could we have Senator WILLIAMS' concluding statement?

Senator WILLIAMS. Well I want to first of all give Mr. Shuman every credit for good will and a good heart, but the fact is, notwithstanding the good will expressed here, the average American migratory farmworker right now makes less than \$900 a year. His youngsters are falling further and further behind in education. He does not receive any of the public health and welfare services that all other poor Americans receive. He has not had the opportunity to benefit from a floor for wages, there is no minimum wage that applies.

His youngsters are not protected, they are excluded from the provisions of the child labor law except for during school hours. Wherever you look for those legislative efforts to make the beginning of a better life, the American migrant farmer and his family have been left out. They are truly outcasts. Our legislative program deals with every, almost every item, those that we understand at least, the wages, economic conditions, the situation of the children, and opportunity to join in labor unions, yes, I thought we had grown up in this country to know that labor unions are a part of our way of life and that a working man or woman should have an opportunity to express himself and bargain collectively. And this we provide for, as well as looking into the future and providing for an advisory council to advise the President and the Congress on the continuing and the persistent problems of almost 2 million Americans who are desperately left out of the affluent society most of us enjoy.

Mr. SMITH. Gentlemen, I have done nothing but interrupt both of you and I apologize to you.

The time has been simply too brief for such a serious topic.

Thank you very much for coming here to debate this question.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the afterglow of earth's gladdest day we come girding ourselves with its deathless message, as in the sense of the Eternal we take up our daily tasks again in these fields of time.

We rejoice, this hour, that all that the world celebrated yesterday with jubilant awe is not just a promise, but is a possession. Today we may be risen with the One who stepped out of a spoiled and beaten grave. Already we have passed from death to life.

May we know in truth that life in the here and now takes on a new sheen, a new value, a new dimension.

Above all the clamor of these agitated days may we hear Thy call to that which is excellent, generous, and true—rising

in newness of life above that which is coarse, selfish, and false.

May the Risen Life make us persons of brotherly love in an unbrotherly world; to others' faults make us forgiving, as we would be forgiven. As our risen lives touch the lives of others, teach us to be gentle in our attitudes, just in our dealings, fair in our judgments, and steadfast in our purpose, though pressed by every foe.

We ask it in the Risen Redeemer's name. Amen.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 30, 1961, the President pro tempore, on March 30, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1163. An act to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 27 months the loan guaranty authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission;

H.R. 5188. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Law Day, U.S.A.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. AIKEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 30, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting

a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the consent calendar be dispensed with.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOCATION OF MISSOURI BASIN WATER RESOURCES—RESOLUTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the allocation of water in the upstream reservoirs on the Missouri River and the proper interpretation of the Flood Control Act of 1944 have received much attention over the past few weeks.

The City Council of Kansas City recently went on record as opposing changes in the present policy of operation of the reservoirs along the Missouri River.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Council of Kansas City, Mo., dated March 24, 1961, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

A resolution protesting proposed change of policy relative to the Flood Control Act for the upper Missouri River

Be it resolved by the Council of Kansas City, That Kansas City, Mo., strongly opposes change in the present policy of operation of the multiple-purpose reservoirs constructed under the authority given in the Flood Control Act of 1944 on the upper Missouri River, which would make the production of the maximum amount of firm hydroelectric power the primary consideration in the release of water. This change would not only be a departure from the objectives of the reservoir construction agreed upon and established when the reservoirs were authorized but would be a breach of faith with all downstream interests which supported the proposal for their construction. Operation primarily, instead of incidentally, for hydroelectric power production is wholly incompatible with flood control, navigation on the lower river, as well as irrigation in the upstream areas. We believe the true objectives are adequately expressed in existing legislation and have been followed in the operating program of the Army Engineers and in the resolutions of the Coordinating Committee of the Missouri River Basin Interagency Committee. Kansas City condemns as unfair and not in the public interest any change which would militate against the multiple-purpose concept of reservoir operation and use originally agreed upon and now in effect; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governors of Missouri and Kansas and to all Members of Congress from those States.

JOHN P. RYAN,
Acting City Manager.
JOHN COSGROVE,
Acting City Counselor.
TOM GAVIN,
Councilman.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 143)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," pursuant to Senate Resolution 240, 86th Congress, 2d session, as extended.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], be printed.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S.1501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation of Government-owned electric and

telephone lines and other utility facilities used for the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S.1502. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide that for certain purposes cargo containers constructed for use with a vessel shall be considered as part of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.1503. A bill for the relief of Mario Simoes Da Fonseca; and

S.1504. A bill for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S.1505. A bill to repeal the tax on general telephone service and the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION — RECOGNITION OF APRIL 15 OF EACH YEAR AS AFRICA FREEDOM DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 118) favoring the recognition of April 15 of each year as Africa Freedom Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AUTHORITY TO SELL GOVERNMENT-OWNED BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE LINES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as my colleagues in the Senate know, various agencies of the Federal Government operate their own electric and telephone systems in isolated areas. During the past year, I have discovered that the Federal agencies are not authorized to expand this service to accommodate the general public.

This matter was brought to the attention of my colleague [Mr. METCALF] and myself when the Range Telephone Co-op, Inc., at Forsyth, Mont., made an application to purchase the telephone system of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, at Lame Deer, Mont., on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. The local community was not receiving telephone service, and the agency switchboard was not being used to capacity, because its services were limited to the local Bureau offices and facilities.

When there are existing utilities and when there is a demand for the service, I think it is perfectly reasonable to permit the utility which is serving the immediate area to negotiate for the purchase of the existing system, so that

new telephone or electric service can be provided to the area. The provisions of the bill which I now introduce, on behalf of my colleague and myself, will permit the sale of the Federal facilities now operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

It is my general impression that the Department of the Interior is sympathetic in regard to the situation that exists on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation, and I hope the Department will be able to expedite its report on this bill. Favorable consideration of this measure will permit the extension of new services in areas that now are isolated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the language of the bill and three pieces of correspondence which are of direct concern in this matter.

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

The bill (S. 1501) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation of Government-owned electric and telephone lines and other utility facilities used for the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), 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:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Except for electric utility systems constructed and operated as a part of an irrigation system, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract under such terms and conditions as he considers to be in the best interest of the Federal Government for the sale, operation, maintenance, repairs, or relocation of Government-owned utilities and utility systems used in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The letters presented by Mr. MANSFIELD are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 17, 1960.

HON. ROGER ERNST,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. ERNST: We are informed that an application has been submitted by the Range Telephone Co-op, Inc., Forsyth, Mont., to purchase the Bureau of Indian Affairs' telephone system which operates at Lame Deer, Mont., on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

As you know, there is no commercial telephone service in Lame Deer and the only telephone system is operated by the Bureau for its own use. Until such time as some other company or agency is prepared to supply this service to the Bureau there is no alternative. We now understand that the Range Telephone Co-op, Inc., is investigating the possibility of extending their lines to serve this area if there is an adequate number of interested consumers. Surveys show that service to the agency offices is vital in any plan which would bring commercial telephone service to Lame Deer.

Officers of the Range Telephone Co-op, Inc., visited our offices last week and stated that they were interested in buying the Bureau's exchange and integrating it into their system in the area. The application has been submitted authorizing this purchase and is now pending before the Director of Property and Management in the Department of the Interior. According to our information no objections have been made in the field or here in Washington. Such a purchase appears to be in the best interests of the general public and would promote the extension of telephone service to more isolated areas.

We would appreciate your checking into the status of this application and your assistance in expediting final action would be most appreciated. Telephone service is widespread in the rural areas of Montana but this area within the Northern Cheyenne Reservation still remains unserved and the local inhabitants are very anxious to have telephone service made available to them.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1960.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This is in response to letter dated August 17, 1960, signed by you, Senator MURRAY, and Congressman METCALF, which concerns the desire of the Range Telephone Co-op, Inc., Forsyth, Mont., to purchase the Bureau of Indian Affairs' telephone system at Lame Deer, Mont., on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

It is true there is no commercial telephone service in Lame Deer and such service is needed. It is also true that the only telephone system there is operated by the Bureau for its own use; and it is not authorized to spend Government funds for the purpose of expanding this service to accommodate the general public. The logical move, therefore, seems to be for a commercial telephone company to supply the service needs of the Bureau and the needs of the general public.

The difficulty we face is the fact that there is no authority to dispose of a serviceable utility system when there is a continuing need for the service by the Federal agency. Authority exists only to dispose of property no longer required.

We do believe that in such cases, and this is not the only Bureau utility with these circumstances, we should have authority to negotiate sales when there would be a resultant benefit to the Government and to the general public. To that end we are planning to seek legislation in the next session of Congress which will authorize such disposals. Until we obtain such authority we feel there is no way this transaction can be consummated. It is regretted that our reply must be unfavorable.

An identical reply is going to Senator MURRAY and Congressman METCALF.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER F. BENNETT,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1961.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In answer to your letter of January 31, you are advised

that the telephone system at Lame Deer, Mont., is not excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and therefore cannot be disposed of without special legislation.

We are pleased to be able to inform you that the Bureau now has an excess line running from Ashland, Mont., to Lame Deer, Mont. This line will be disposed of by the Bureau's area office in Billings, Mont., in accordance with existing regulations. By acquisition of this line, the Range Telephone Cooperative, Inc., will be able to provide dial service to the residents of Lame Deer immediately. It is hoped that disposal of the line from Ashland to Lame Deer by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will result in phone service being made available to the residents of Lame Deer without delay.

In accordance with your request there is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill which would provide authority for the disposition of the system at Lame Deer. We have drafted this bill broad enough to cover all other similar utility systems operated by the Bureau. At the present time the Bureau has perhaps six or eight systems that are similar to the circumstances surrounding Lame Deer. As cooperatives and utility companies move closer to reservations, others will develop and the Bureau should have the authority to act when these commercial companies are in a position to provide a utility service to the general public around an Indian reservation and disposition of the system is in the interest of the Government.

The draft has been prepared as a drafting service, and I am sure you understand that because it has not been cleared through the Bureau of the Budget it is submitted without commitment from the Department.

The enclosures with your letter are being returned and a copy of this letter is being sent to Senator METCALF.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER TRAVEL AND LOCAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the tax on general telephone service and the tax on transportation of persons.

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

The bill (S. 1505) to repeal the tax on general telephone service and the tax on transportation of persons, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this measure will repeal, effective the first month after enactment, the 10 percent excise tax on passenger travel, and the 10 percent tax on local telephone service.

Both taxes were imposed during time of war not simply for money-raising purposes, but primarily to discourage wartime use of limited transportation and communication facilities.

The latter purpose is no longer applicable, and there are ample ways of raising the revenue from more equitable sources. These excise taxes are unfair to those who must pay them, and are a very heavy burden upon the industries they affect.

Both should be dropped in their entirety.

VOTING RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS; CONSTITUTION SHOULD BE AMENDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when a Member of the House of Representatives I introduced a resolution more than 18 years ago to amend the Constitution and extend voting rights to 18-year-olds. My interest in this matter has not abated during the almost two decades which have intervened. On March 29, 1960, I presented Senate Joint Resolution 179 for this purpose. Senator BYRD of West Virginia joined me in introduction of the measure to amend the Constitution to provide for such voting.

It is gratifying, therefore, to observe that this concern is shared by other Members of this body, and particularly by our able colleagues, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the leader of the minority, the eloquent junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—each of whom has independently submitted such a resolution during this session of Congress.

I shall not presume upon the time of the Senate in order to relate the arguments which are well known to all of us. However, I believe it would be of more than passing interest and value to summarize the actions of the individual States in this field, and to note the present status of age requirements that prevail in the various States.

ALASKA AND HAWAII ACT

It is, perhaps, not mere coincidence or an accident of history that the two States most recently admitted to the Union, and hence the two which have achieved statehood under distinctively modern conditions of education and communication, are among the few with voting limitations of less than 21 years. The State of Alaska entered the Union under a constitution approved by a 2-to-1 majority which established the voting age at 19 years or above. During the same year our friends in Hawaii were admitted to the Union under a constitution which provided for voting at the age of 20 or above.

However, the first State to take positive action in this field was the State of Georgia, which lowered the voting age to 18 by referendum in 1943. The State of Kentucky, after several inconclusive efforts in the legislature during the forties and early fifties, finally succeeded in having the issue put to a referendum test, and in 1955 the citizens of Kentucky voted to lower the voting age to 18.

This is the roster of the States, Mr. President, where a voting age of less than 21 prevails. But it is not an accurate index of the actions taken by the other individual States, nor is it an adequate gauge of the interest and sentiment among the American people in favor of lowering the voting age.

Since October 21, 1942, when I first submitted my resolution (H.J. Res. 354) in the other body—a time which I use as a benchmark simply because it relates to my own actions in this field—all but three of the States have taken some

legislative action to lower the voting age, many of them having made repeated efforts. And in no less than 14 States—according to a study performed by the Library of Congress—measures to lower the voting age to 18 have passed in at least one house of the legislature. In three States—Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee—such measures have passed both houses, but have failed for lack of meeting other requirements of the amendment procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute, since there are few Senators who wish to make speeches?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is granted 2 additional minutes.

TWENTY-THIRD AMENDMENT IS RATIFIED

Mr. RANDOLPH. These actions have been taken, Mr. President, without benefit of the added momentum which would accrue if there were a national movement to amend the Federal Constitution. We have recently seen how effective such an effort can be in the record time in which the 23d amendment was ratified by the States.

Gratifying though it is to see the enfranchisement of the citizens of the District of Columbia, their plight was no less real or urgent than that of the millions of 18 to 21 year olds who bear so many of the responsibilities of citizenship without this most essential prerogative. It is, therefore, in the hope of correcting this inequity that I submit this resolution to amend the Constitution and extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1961, the name of Mr. PASTORE was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1434) to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators) on March 24, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1961, the names of Senators LONG of Missouri, PASTORE, YOUNG of Ohio, METCALF, MORSE, HART, DOUGLAS, PROXMIER, GRUENING, MCGEE, RANDOLPH, COOPER, PELL, and BARTLETT were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 115) to create the Select Committee on Consumer Interests, submitted by Mrs. NEUBERGER, on March 24, 1961.

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. SCHOEPPPEL:

Address entitled "Medical Care for the Aged," delivered by Senator BENNETT before the Harvard Medical School, at Boston, Mass., on January 27, 1961;

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a tribute to my late colleague, Senator James E. Murray, prepared by Mr. Walter W. Heller.

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

STATEMENT OF TRIBUTE BY WALTER W. HELLER

It is with great sadness that I learned of the death of former Senator James E. Murray of Montana. Senator Murray's record of devoted service to his country, which he served for more than a quarter of a century as an eloquent, energetic, wise, and dedicated Member of the Senate, is an inspiring one. His passionate concern with the elimination of social injustice was responsible for the series of legislative proposals, with which his name is inseparably linked.

High among these is the Employment Act of 1946. He, more than any other single person, was the builder of this act. He sponsored it. He was responsible for the basic policy decisions which engendered it. His conviction and energy were crucial in transforming the idea behind the act into a specific legislative proposal, and his courage and unwavering faith were instrumental in shepherding the act into law.

It is now my privilege to serve as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was created by this act. I know that I am joined by my colleagues on the Council, past and present, in expressing our real sense of personal loss at the passing of this courageous and dedicated legislator.

RONALD W. MAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that one of the outstanding newspapermen stationed in the Capitol, Mr. Ronald May, of the Madison Capital Times, Madison, Wis., and other newspapers, passed away suddenly this morning.

Mr. May had the reputation of being a good reporter. When he got onto a story, he followed it through to its logical conclusion. In doing so, he stepped on people's toes; but he always seemed to be able to achieve his objective.

It is with regret that I announce that this fine journalist and outstanding reporter passed away this morning, at the age of 38.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of Mr. May.

ALASKA'S NEWLY PROJECTED MARINE HIGHWAYS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the general election in Alaska, last November, the people of Alaska approved four bond issues.

One was for a gymnasium and powerplant for our excellent University of Alaska, a land-grant college a few miles west of Fairbanks.

Another bond issue was for a vocational boarding school north of the Yukon.

A third was for the development of airports throughout Alaska.

The fourth, in the amount of \$23 million, was for two ferry systems and highways.

It is of the last that I wish to say a few words. The State legislature, which now is concluding its third annual session, implemented this bond issue vote by appropriate legislative action. Eighteen million dollars will go toward the two ferry systems. Five million dollars will go for roads. Actually, it would be correct to say that the entire amount will be expended on highways, for the two ferry systems have been aptly referred to as marine highways, which is, indeed, what they are.

Alaska coast is a fragmented one. It consists of both rugged mainland shorelines and thousands of islands. Indeed, southeastern Alaska, the narrow 300-mile so-called panhandle, which extends northwesterly along the upper end of the famous Inside Passage, is, in addition to a narrow strip of precipitous mainland indented by deep, canyon-like fiords, also an archipelago. It consists of hundreds of islands, some of very substantial size. It is virtually impossible to construct a north-south land highway over this rugged terrain. But through the islands thread magnificent waterways—the famed Inside Passage, with its ramifications—passing through some of the most beautiful scenery on

earth. Large car ferries are the answer to this problem.

A similar situation exists farther west, where the island of Kodiak—about the size of Puerto Rico—is separated by the deep waters of Shelikof Straits from the mainland. The fishing town of Seldovia, at the southwestern end of the Kenai Peninsula, although on the mainland, is, like so many other Alaskan communities, not accessible by highway. A ferry from Anchorage, connecting these points, and perhaps others, will supply the transportation that is now lacking except for air service.

Kodiak Island is entitled to, and needs, more than air transportation. Except for an occasional freighter, it has no maritime service. It houses the headquarters of the 17th Naval District, and of the Alaska Sea Frontier. It contains the oldest community in Alaska, at least in historic times—one which dates from the closing days of the 18th century, when it was settled by the Russians. It is the center of the important and recently developed king crab industry. These crustaceans are giant in size, the larger specimens measure over 5 feet across, and their meat has found ready acceptance as a delicacy throughout our Nation.

Kodiak is also famed for its great brown bear, the largest carnivore on earth, and for years an attraction to big-game hunters. Kodiak is developing a beef cattle industry, for which its mild winter climate, caused by the warm Japan current, is particularly propitious.

The new ferry systems will greatly increase the accessibility of all parts of Alaska. Today, virtually the only ingress or egress is by air. Passenger service on the only U.S. steamship line from Seattle to Alaska was suspended in 1954. Several excellent cruise ships come up the Inside Passage during the summer months; likewise, once a week a Canadian Pacific vessel makes the trip.

But experience has shown clearly in recent years that many Americans would like to travel by automobile from their homes in the 48 lower States to Alaska. The southeastern ferry will enable them to go directly by highway to Prince Rupert, British Columbia, passing on their way through our scenic Northwest and the Canadian Rockies. The southeastern Alaska ferry system will begin at Prince Rupert, and will take the cars and passengers aboard. It will stop, northbound, at Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines, and Skagway. Each of these southeastern Alaska coastal towns contains much to attract visitors. They can take their cars off in each, see the sights, and await the next ferry; or they can travel on through to Haines or Skagway, both superb in their scenery. At Haines, near the north end of the terminal fiord of the Inside Passage, known as Lynn Canal, the Haines cutoff will permit them to drive their cars to the Alaska Highway, and over it into western Alaska.

Reentering Alaska over the Alaska Highway, they can proceed northward to Fairbanks. They can take an alluring side trip over the Taylor Highway to Eagle, on the shore of the mighty

Yukon; or they can swing southward over the Tok cutoff, skirting the giant Wrangell Mountains, and into the scenic Glenn Highway, with alternative routes to Valdez, on the Pacific, or to Alaska's metropolis, Anchorage. Or they can continue up the Alaska Highway to Big Delta, and strike southward on the Richardson Highway to the Denali Highway, which leads them directly into Mount McKinley National Park, where 90 more miles of highway within the park lead them to spectacular views of the monarch of the North American Continent, 20,300-foot Mount McKinley.

Or, after proceeding along the Glenn Highway to Anchorage, they may pass through it to Seward, on Resurrection Bay, or diverge along the Taylor Highway into the Kenai Peninsula. Or they may, from Anchorage, take their cars on the ferry to Kodiak.

Everywhere these visitors will see scenic beauty beyond compare, the unspoiled wonders of the last frontier.

The new projected ferry systems—the marine highways—will make all this possible, and will permit the visitors to return to their homes by a different route—the Alaska Highway, which will take them back home through Canada. Or they can reverse the process—driving up over the Alaska Highway, and returning after their vacations in Alaska by way of Haines and the southeastern Alaska ferry to Prince Rupert.

This projected ferry system will make the most beautiful scenery on the North American Continent and the unique wildlife resources of Alaska readily available to those who wish to drive to Alaska and savor of the friendly hospitality of the last frontier. For those who have not visited the 49th State, it will be an unforgettable experience.

LATIN AMERICA REPORTS BY SENATOR AIKEN AND SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 1961 issue of the Foreign Service Journal appears an article entitled "A Footnote to Recent History." The article was written by L. D. Mallory; and in it references are made to the reports prepared by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who at this time is the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as a result of their trips to South America. In the article much is said concerning the reports prepared by those two Senators; and reference is made to the fact that both of them will be benchmarks in our relationships with Latin America.

Because of the pertinence and timeliness of the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Foreign Service Journal, March 1961]

A FOOTNOTE TO RECENT HISTORY
(By L. D. Mallory)

The "dismal science" of economics is on the verge of yet another retouching, re-

shaping, and remodeling. It is scarcely 9 years since a book entitled "The Big Change" gained wide currency by calling attention to a revolution that had taken place in basic concepts of American business, industry, and finance. It seems safe, nevertheless, to predict that we are now seeing the beginning of a new shift in emphasis and approach to America's concepts of economic productivity. Until recently, what was termed "social infrastructure" was not eligible for financing as part of economic development. Now, more and more, it is becoming respectable to consider financing some programs of social development as necessary for a healthy economy.

Soon there will be dissertations on the origins of the new trend and fine-spun arguments of rationale. Factors now included in the somewhat esoteric catchall term of "social infrastructure" will be worked over as important components of economics. One is impelled to throw out a few hints to future analysts: to point out to them influence they might otherwise overlook when they shuffle through contemporary headlines and commentaries on the chain of events we have witnessed in recent years.

In this mood, the opinion is ventured that, at least as far as the Government of the United States is concerned, two reports prepared by Senators AIKEN and MORSE after separate trips to Latin America in 1959 furnished the initial impulses for changes in official-level thinking and policies that set in motion the trend mentioned above.¹ Before those reports were issued, agencies in international finance had held that development comes only in terms of increased output or productivity and that, therefore, loans should not be concluded for other purposes. Our foreign aid program was administered in this spirit. Emphasis was placed on direct results from increase in production of goods and rise in gross national product, although exceptions were made, as in expenditures for technical assistance in the fields of education, health, and sanitation. Loans in such fields as housing were vetoed as not consistent with accepted theory concerning the bases for development. Now, economic pundits seem to have reviewed their thinking. They are beginning to define housing as being productive because workers who are inadequately housed cannot give a full measure of effort. Signs are already at hand that, by extension, a similar view will soon be taken toward health, educational, and other social factors. I believe it is fair to trace this evolution of thinking in the executive branch to questions asked of the lending agencies by Members of Congress. If I remember correctly, it was not until thereafter that the agencies began to entertain requests for foreign loans on housing.

Taking the senatorial reports as a point of departure, the sequence of events has been nothing short of dramatic. Early in 1960, a partial awakening to the shaky social substructure of many governments in Latin America took place in the United States. Reasoning on the subject covered a wide range of attitudes. There were those who saw, yet did not believe; those who did not see at all; and those who did see and believed that wide disparities in the social fabric of many countries in the hemisphere threatened the institutions of the Americas.

The force of this third group's convictions was largely responsible for the new departure taken by the executive branch of our Government when, on July 11, President Eisenhower announced from Newport, R.I., a "social development plan" addressed to Latin America in which it was provided that financial aid to cope with certain social prob-

lems could be extended to countries willing to participate. Congress opened the way for implementing this plan when, on August 31, 1960, it passed authorizing legislation for a \$500 million social development fund. In September, at the hemisphere-wide meeting on economic questions held in Bogotá, Colombia, the U.S. delegation advanced the President's plan. It was enthusiastically received and, following some negotiation and drafting changes, adopted as the Act of Bogotá. The act is signally important. To put it mildly, new ground was broken by our Government's willingness to extend aid abroad for social infrastructure, and by hemispheric acceptance of the need to act on social reforms.

The act has four main sections: The first related to measures for social improvement, the second to the creation of a special fund for social development, the third to measures for economic development, and the fourth to multilateral cooperation for social and economic progress.

Implicit in this agreement is the engagement of the several countries to undertake steps to make the program workable. This may prove to be the crux of the matter. It does no good to plan on improved land use, for example, when land titles are not clear or even unavailable. In the same field of land use, the incidence of the tax burden may be determinant, and require adjustment in basic legislation.

Latin America's new-found willingness to undertake long-needed reforms and to bring about social changes stems from recognition of the same facts that prompted the United States to propose a social development program for Latin America. The first, the simple unvarnished fact is that, like it or not, change will come; that, if it does not come by planned orderly evolution, it will be imposed by violent revolution. The second is that, as they are now constituted, the governments of Latin America cannot, from their own resources, hope to promote evolution at a pace capable of satisfying the fast-mounting aspirations of their peoples.

At Bogotá other countries inquired anxiously whether the program was a one-shot affair. The chief U.S. delegate, Under Secretary of State Dillon, indicated that additional assistance would be forthcoming in the future. Therefore, passage by our Congress of appropriating legislation to enable the Act of Bogotá to get underway is awaited by the other countries of the hemisphere with a marked sense of urgency.

At Bogotá, decision was also made to have a separate entity, the new Inter-American Development Bank, administer as a trustee the major portion of the funds to become available. This unusual feature in international arrangements appears to have been signally fortunate. A regional organ that will administer funds along agreed lines should, by removing the United States and Latin American governments from the immediate scene of negotiations, reduce the frictions sure to arise recurrently over the question of whether a given country is doing its part. It must be evident that unless real, visible, and effective efforts are made by all, our Congress cannot be expected to continue making appropriations for the program. Also, achievement of the purposes of the Act of Bogotá program will, for some time, remain as urgent and essential as the day the act was adopted. The considerable history of cooperation by the hemisphere countries in the Organization of American States gives reason for optimism about the functioning of the new Bank. A regional international organization of its type was probably a prerequisite to acceptance and administration of the social program. Without the history of hemispheric cooperation, the Act of Bogotá probably would not have been adopted unanimously by those joining; that is, by all countries except Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

The free countries of the Americas thus enter the spring of 1961 armed with a brave new concept. The United States is sincere in its desire to make it work. Forward-looking statesmen in Latin America are almost desperately anxious for it to work, and to work quickly. The Inter-American Development Bank staff will do its polynational best. Doubts admittedly exist in some minds as to whether traditional inertia in several countries can be overcome by these new hopes and plans. Privileges have seldom been abandoned except under pressure of strong measures. Perhaps argument and persuasion will now succeed better than in the past because they will acquire cogency from consciousness of the forces now rampant in the world.

To return now to my hint to future analysts, to the "footnote to history," I would add a few comments about those responsible for this profound policy change. Even a brief exposure to Washington bureaucracy teaches that hardly ever is one man, and seldom are only few persons, responsible for a given event or chain of events. Therefore, I do not intend to oversimplify, and so mislead future historians. Many in the Foreign Service and the Department appreciated the urgency of problems of social development in most countries of Latin America and longed for a chance to move to resolve them. However, in the system as it has operated, their several judgments were not synthesized into positions or policy. For all intents and purposes, they remained mute. Credit, therefore, for taking the lead in stating the problems and for making the issues clear and public, belongs to the legislative branch. The Aiken and Morse reports were benchmarks. Wide appreciation is due the knowledge and understanding shown by Senator MANSFIELD. Respectful note should be taken of the concrete proposals of Senator SMATHERS. The list of credits due to Members of Congress does not, of course, close with these names.

There was, and is, one person to be especially singled out for this whole new departure in international relations; and he was not in the Government. Insights and appreciations gained from his first trip through South America in 1953 and subsequent travel into 1960 gave Dr. Milton Eisenhower the information which he talked over from time to time with his brother, the Chief Executive. This dramatic departure in diplomacy, economics, foreign aid policy, or whatever we may call it, that bears the imprint of President Eisenhower, was pointed out to him primarily by Dr. Eisenhower. It is now being based upon a deep consciousness of foreign affairs by the Congress. One paragraph of the statement made at Bogotá by the chairman of the Latin American Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate, Senator WAYNE MORSE, should be repeated:

"Of all of these elements, as well as others which I shall not take the time to touch on, I think the one which loomed biggest in the congressional view was the emphasis upon self-help. This, in turn, was based upon the concept, for which history provides ample support, that the basic, the most important, factor in development is people who really want development and who want it badly enough not only to work for it but make their own substantial economic contributions as well as give up certain traditional customs in order to get it. Unless this basic urge is present, no amount of outside assistance will be effective."

STATEMENT BY EDWARD R. MURROW ON WORK OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last month, at the time his nomination as Director of the U.S. Information

¹ Report of Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN on a study mission, Feb. 2, 1960.

Report of Senator WAYNE MORSE on a study mission, Feb. 20, 1960.

Agency was submitted, Edward R. Murrow made a short statement.

Mr. Murrow set out his views on the role of the USIA in presenting the story of our country to peoples in other nations. He emphasized that truth and faith in freedom are our strongest weapons, and gave his appraisal of the tasks facing this country, referring to them as the "pivot upon which the history of our time will turn."

I commend this fine statement to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF EDWARD R. MURROW, NOMINEE TO BE DIRECTOR, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. MURROW. My name is Edward R. Murrow. I was christened Egbert but abandoned that name at the age of 16 while working in logging camps in western Washington.

Most of my adult life has been spent in the periphery of the academic world and in the field of radio and television. These activities have involved considerable travel, at home and abroad, and some acquaintance with statesmen, educators, and newsmen in many countries.

WORK OF USIA ABROAD

As a foreign correspondent, I am more familiar with the work of the U.S. Information Agency abroad than here in Washington.

At the conclusion of a trip around the world several months ago, I gave it as my opinion that the work of USIA abroad had improved very considerably under the direction of Ambassador George Allen, and am pleased to have the opportunity to repeat that opinion here.

ROLE OF USIA

If I am confirmed in the office to which the President has nominated me, I shall attempt to discharge the duties and responsibilities of that office to the best of my ability.

The Agency will attempt to make U.S. policy, as designed by the President, everywhere intelligent and, wherever possible, palatable.

We shall endeavor to reflect with fidelity to our allies, to the uncommitted nations, and to those who are hostile to us, not only our policy but our ideals.

We shall operate on the basis of truth. Being convinced that we are engaged in hot and implacable competition with Communist forces around the world, we will not be content to counter their lies and distortions. We shall constantly reiterate our faith in freedom.

To the emerging nations we shall say, "We share your dreams." There is a dynamism in freedom which permits and encourages progress without binding the individual to the wheel of the state. We shall try to make it clear that we as a Nation are not allergic to change and have no desire to sanctify the status quo. This Nation not only has a birth certificate, it holds the patent rights on change and revolution by consent.

EXAMPLE OF THIS NATION

The Agency will try to speak on behalf of all the American people with restraint and reason. All of us in the Agency recognize that in spite of electronic developments, the best form of communications is still face to face. To that end, any men and women we recruit and train must be able and eager to serve the cause of freedom which we regard as being indivisible.

The voice of this country should at all times be steady—firm but not bellicose—

carrying the convictions that we will not flinch or falter in the face of threats or provocations.

In the end of the day it may well be that the example of this Nation will be more important than its dollars or its words. If we, in this generous and capacious land, can demonstrate increasing equality of opportunity, social justice, a reasoned concern for the education, health, and the equality under law of all our citizens, we will powerfully affect, and probably determine, the destiny of the free world and that freedom may be contagious, may incite those who have lost that most precious of all possessions to strive to do likewise.

CONTEST BETWEEN FORCES OF FREEDOM AND DICTATORSHIP

No man can set either a time or dollar limit upon this contest between the forces of freedom and those who would demean and brutalize mankind. The contest will be prolonged and it will cost much treasure. There is no guarantee that we will win it. If we should lose, it will be by default, and history will take its revenge. We cannot imitate the tactics or the techniques of the dictatorships that now ride the backs of most of this planet's people. We cannot threaten, we must persuade. Freedom cannot be imposed, it must be sought for, and frequently fought for.

We live in a world we didn't make. We are honored by an awesome responsibility of leadership we did not seek. We must defend and expand the leadership in company with our allies and other likeminded peoples because that is what our history and our heritage demand of us. We are the pivot upon which the history of our time will turn. Our task is formidable and difficult, but difficulty is one excuse history has never accepted.

We must, I think, approach the task with patience and fortitude and with an abiding belief that not only our own ancestors who bought our freedom for us but all those who have suffered and struggled and died in the pursuit of freedom throughout all time are watching to see whether we be worthy of our heritage.

If I am confirmed in the office to which the President has appointed me, I will, together with my colleagues in the Agency, attempt to be worthy of the trust.

THERE'S MORE TO SEE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Larston D. Farrar and published in *Variety*, 55th anniversary edition, entitled "There's More To See in Washington, D.C."

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

THERE'S MORE TO SEE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Larston D. Farrar)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Washington, D.C., as contrasted to Washington, Va., or Washington, Pa., or Washington, Ohio, or wherever, is a strange town. For instance, it is the only town in the United States with my name in the telephone book, and, although there are thousands of writers in Washington, I am the only one listed as a "writer."

The others are listed as columnists, reporters, journalists, public relations men, administrative assistants, liaison officers, commentators, information specialists, communications counselors, or whatever. There's just one big difference between them and me—they eat steak. It's natural that they should take titles other than writers, in

Washington. Here, a janitor is not a janitor but an assistant to the administrative director of maintenance operations.

Because I am listed as a writer, people are always asking me for advice about writing. I give them all the advice I know, in a few well-chosen words, and sum it up with one admonition: "If you persist in trying to make a living in this crazy game, remember my advice: Get out."

The Washington telephone book is quite revealing. It shows that Washington has terrific unused talent for both show business and the literary field. You can find Dora Schary's name there, and Gerry Wald's, and even Lilly Wilder's. Also, Louella Kilgallen, Frank Hemingway, and Joe Faulkner. I understand that Clark Gabriel is the most popular guy up around U Street, being pursued by all the gals. Real talent, that fellow. And if you want to see a well-built doll, just look up Janet Mansfield. Wow! Seriously, Thomas Wolfe is a reporter on the Post and they are going to put a plaque where John Charles Daly used to stand when he was a bus dispatcher for the old Capital Transit Co. Washington is a city filled with brains, although I admit it is difficult to find much wisdom there.

In Washington, you can hear politicians all talking about overall figures, but not a single one of them has a pair of overalls. In fact, my wife says that few of them have figures.

Washington is filled with insurance men who will sell you blanket coverage—if you will just sell your blankets and pay them cash.

DITTO IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In New York, a lot of rubes have purchased the Brooklyn Bridge—paid for it in cash, I understand. But in Washington, all the rubes have bought everything they see. Unfortunately, the tourists can no more move the various monuments and marbled buildings, which they "own," than can the people who purchased the Brooklyn Bridge. In fact, if a taxpayer even loiters around one of his own public buildings in Washington, past visiting hours, he's liable to be arrested by one of his own policemen. The White House, in which the peepul have some \$20 million invested, is not even fully open to the public. The average man can see only a part of it by Executive order—the part the President seldom uses, or even sees. And every Executive gives the same orders, believe me.

ONLY IN WASHINGTON

Only in Washington, as Harry Golden would say, could you pick up a newspaper and see a headline like this: "Devoted father slays wife, three children." That's the way devoted fathers act these days in Washington, and maybe in other places in the country.

Or you pick up a newspaper on another day, in case you can read, and someone leaves it on the seat beside you. Another headline catches your eye: "Ideal bank teller arrested as thief." The story tells how this teller was voted the ideal bank employee for 3 years, and now, in the fourth year, was arrested for embezzling.

You don't blink your eyes—in Washington—at such things. It's perfectly normal for a devoted father to kill his wife and children, or for an ideal bank teller to be caught stealing. That's just the way things are.

You go into a bar—you must go into a bar, if you expect to retain your sanity, or to see any other people—and even before you take a drink, you hear a conversation like this:

"Are you a Secretary or an Under Secretary?"

"I'm the Secretary of my Division, but don't confuse me with the Under Secretary, who is over me. In our agency, there is an Under Secretary who has several Secretaries under him, and he has a Secretary. Each Secretary also has a battery of secretaries.

That's why I worked so hard to get this job of Secretary and why I'm angling for the post of Under Secretary."

It made sense to me, for I took a course in government in college.

In Washington, the winning candidate is the man who has stood up to be counted—on both sides.

It's not farfetched—to those who will stand off (without being standoffish) and view the Nation's Capital figuratively from a distance—to understand why I say that Washington is the most beautiful stage in existence today. For one thing, it undoubtedly is the most costly. A cool estimate is that the people have billions invested in Capitol Hill alone, and this does not include all the monuments and marbled buildings within just a few miles of the Capitol.

In Washington, everybody is trying to cut down the other fellow, while smiling at his opponent in public. Or, as Confucius say: "Cannibal who persists in decapitating victim only trying to get a head."

People in Washington have various goals. A lot of people who look like tourists line up to get into the Department of Justice every day. Others, who look like tourists, are trying to get away from the Department of Justice.

Many of both groups look like candidates for the 10 most unwanted persons in the country, and most of them, wanted or not, have a hard time getting a glimpse of J. Edgar You-Know-Whom. There's a sign at the Internal Revenue Service which offers "free guides." It turns out that they are special agents who will lead you on a tour that ends up in a special examination room, where, among other things, they get your fingerprints and demand to see a carbon of your 1960 income tax return. Or, if you don't like to fool around there, you can get directions as to how to go on a wild goose chase at the Fish and Wildlife Service. This is in the Department of the Interior, which, of course, superintends the exterior—the great outdoors.

Nothing is what it seems to be in Washington. The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is not the place to go to find out whether or not you have ulcers, believe me. And if you are looking for something different, why not visit the office of the South Dakota Congressman who advertises that his State is the land of infinite variety.

One man is trying to get off the FBI's 10 most wanted list. But another fellow I know is striving to become the most wanted by the FBI girls.

By all odds, Washington has the best paid stars and extras of any production company on earth. If the politicians drawing all this money weren't smiling—when the television cameramen focus in their direction—the people would have real cause to wonder. The Federal payroll now runs more than \$1 billion a month.

There are more curious people—with curiosity, too—in Washington than anywhere else in the world. They come around asking me questions like this: "How do you get to be Washington editor for so many magazines?"

I tell of my first effort to become Washington editor for a business journal. I heard that the editor was looking for a man, and checking myself to be sure I was a man, I called the editor in Chicago (on the telephone, for I had laryngitis that week) and asked:

"May I be your Washington editor?"

"What are your qualifications?" he came back.

"I'm as crazy as anyone else I know here," I replied.

I was hired.

As recently as the other day, a New York editor called me on the telephone. He was in a Washington hotel, here to visit with his Washington editor.

"Why didn't you appoint me your Washington editor for your new magazine?" I asked. I'm always circumspect like that, beating around the bush, you know.

"Have you any money?" he answered me with a question.

"What's that?" I shot back.

When he explained about money, I said: "Oh, yes; I understand now. No, right at this moment, I don't have any. But my wife has money. The only trouble is that by the time she gets back from the grocery store, neither of us will have any."

"Just as I thought," he said. "The man I appointed to be my Washington editor also had to be an investor in this new magazine. Naturally, if a man has a million-dollar trust fund, he makes a wonderful Washington editor."

"Of course," I replied, urbanely, but my heart was beating fast. This low-living heel had the nerve to mention literary material, great writing, and all that, in the same breath as he talked about money. How crass can things get? Next thing you know, diskjockeys will be taking payola and Congressmen will be putting kinfolks on their payroll. Mercy, mercy. The avarice of bounds may know no man.

ODD JOBS GALORE

All my life, I have heard people talk about the odd jobs in Hollywood. But there are more odd jobs in Washington than in any other city on earth. For example, there's a man in charge of keeping Japanese beetles off airplanes. He has been getting publicity, but has little hope that the beetles will read it. He is trying to get members of the public to recognize a Japanese beetle when they see one. But there are so many problems. Most people think that any beetle is a Japanese beetle. You would think by now that people would look at the eyes and, if they weren't slanted, they would know that the beetle was a good old beetle of the type that doesn't do too much harm. But no; they persist in reporting every beetle as a Japanese beetle. It just proves again that people are so very unobservant.

One of the oldest ways of getting a job—in Washington—is to apply to be a radio or TV news commentator. They are not interested in what you know, if anything. They want to know three things—(1) how good looking you are; (2) how deep your voice is, and (3) whether or not you can pronounce words correctly. For—alas!—a news commentator no more has to know news, or history, or government, than a quiz show winner had to know the answers, spontaneously.

Yes, even after I have told you this little bit, you can take it from me that there's more to see in Washington, D.C., and I'm not talking about me.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS—ENFORCEMENT OF 3-MINUTE LIMITATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a bill for consideration, I wish to say that the extension under the 3-minute rule, during the morning hour which has just been concluded, is not to be taken as a precedent. It is the exception which proves the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer clearly understands that there were extenuating circumstances.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 122, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) expressing the sense of Congress on Project Hope.

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 concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to the preamble, so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Whereas the need for ever-increasing peaceful, humanitarian cooperation between the people of the United States and the peoples of other nations of the world is apparent; and

Whereas under the authorization of the President of the United States the United States Navy has furnished a mothballed hospital ship to the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, under private charter; and

Whereas the People-to-People Health Foundation, Incorporated, has engaged and staffed and equipped the hospital ship *Consolation*—now known as the steamship *Hope I*—as a floating medical training-teaching center currently serving in southeast Asia; and

Whereas the chief purpose of this undertaking, called Project Hope, is to bring to the medical professions of these developing nations the latest skills and techniques developed by the American medical and dental professions; and

Whereas the medical ship is staffed with medical personnel selected from among the top men and women of our medical, dental, and health professions; and

Whereas the \$3,500,000 needed to staff and operate this hospital ship for a year is being raised from private sources throughout the country; and

Whereas Project Hope has received the enthusiastic support of Government, industry, business, labor, the medical, pharmaceutical, and dental professions and private citizens throughout the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Project Hope be commended as another step forward in increasing good will throughout the world and in bringing the peoples of all nations together in a bond of mutual trust, friendship, and cooperation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the report which came from the Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on January 23, 1961. A series of "whereas" clauses describes in general terms the steps taken by the U.S. Government and various private groups to equip a hospital ship to serve as a floating medical training-teaching center for the purpose of bringing the latest medical skills to developing nations.

The operating portion of the resolution simply commends this project—Project

Hope—as another step toward increased good will throughout the world and bringing the peoples of all nations together in a bond of mutual trust, friendship, and cooperation.

The Department of State, in response to a request by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 8 welcomed and supported the proposed congressional commendation of Project Hope. The letter from the Department of State is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In your letter of January 24, you asked for the Department's comments on Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, introduced on January 23 by Senator HUMPHREY, expressing the sense of Congress on Project Hope.

The Department welcomes and supports this proposed congressional commendation of this project. Dr. William Walsh and his associates in the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., deserve such commendation for their successful work in this worthwhile cause. The nationwide fund-raising campaign on behalf of Project Hope, and the generous response of thousands of our fellow citizens, reflect the best traditions of American life—and contribute significantly to this Nation's efforts to enhance and expand people-to-people contacts between our country and the less-developed countries of the free world.

As you are aware, the U.S. Government in cooperation with the Project Hope sponsors, has provided substantial assistance to the project. The U.S. Navy hospital ship *Consolation* was made available to the foundation, and the ship was "demothballed" and prepared for sea duty at U.S. Government expense. The sum of \$2.7 million has been provided from mutual security program funds to place the ship in operating condition, and an additional \$500,000 of mutual security program funds was recently provided as an interest-free loan.

The Department has been impressed by the cordial reception accorded in Indonesia to *Hope I* and its fine medical and dental staff. We fully expect that the response in future ports of call will be equally favorable. We trust that these accomplishments and the efforts of the project sponsors will continue to elicit the required financial support of America's people.

In the light of the fine record of Project Hope to date, the Department fully endorses the views regarding the project set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Yours truly,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary,
(For the Secretary of State.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is an amendment to the preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I turn to the next order of business, I wish to say that the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Democratic whip, the senior Senator from Minnesota

[Mr. HUMPHREY], is to be commended for the part he personally played in pushing the resolution and seeing that it was adopted on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

COCOPAH INDIANS IN ARIZONA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 123, Senate bill 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 54) to grant 81 acres of public domain to the Cocopah Indians in Arizona.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a portion of the report on Senate bill 54 from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

The purpose of S. 54, introduced by Senator GOLDWATER, is to place in trust 81 acres of land in Arizona for the Cocopah Indians.

The Cocopah Tribe occupies land on the east side of the Colorado River, near the Yuma reclamation project, that was set aside for them by Executive order in 1917. During the intervening years they have lived upon the land to be set aside by S. 54 in the belief it was included within the original reservation. A recent opinion of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, concludes that said lands were not part of the reservation.

Since the Cocopahs have used the land, are living on it at the present time, and no claim has been filed on any of the lands, the committee believes the 81 acres should be made a part of the existing reservation.

Legislation identical with S. 54 passed the Senate on March 28, 1960.

The favorable reports of the Department of the Interior and Bureau of the Budget on S. 54 follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 54, a bill to grant 81 acres of public domain to the Cocopah Indians in Arizona.

The purpose of the bill is to donate in trust to the Cocopah Indians 81 acres of public domain which have been occupied by the Cocopah Tribe since 1917 and which was thought until recently to be a part of the reservation.

There is no objection to the enactment of S. 54 from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

On March 3, 1961, the Secretary of the Interior wrote the chairman of the committee in part as follows:

"This will supplement our letter of February 14, 1961, regarding a review of the legis-

lative materials that were submitted to Congress by this Department before January 20, 1961.

"We have completed our review, and we concur in the comments and recommendations made by the prior administration with respect to the following proposed bills and introduced bills:

"INDIANS

"11. Report on S. 54, a bill 'To grant 81 acres of public domain to the Cocopah Indians in Arizona.'

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 54) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest in the following described public domain are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Cocopah Indians in Arizona, subject to any valid existing rights heretofore initiated under the public land laws: lots 14 and 15, section 30, township 9 south, range 24 west; and lots 3, 4, and 5, section 25, township 9 south, range 25 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona, containing 81.64 acres.

PAYMENT OF PER DIEM TO MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 124, Senate bill 1297.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1297) to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the report on Senate bill 1297 from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1297) to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1297, introduced by Senator CHURCH as the result of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior, is to authorize the members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to receive per diem payments at the same rate that is paid to other persons serving the Federal Government without regular compensation.

Presently the five members of the Arts and Crafts Board may receive only \$10 per diem under the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1940. Since 1940 the per diem of other Government employees has been adjusted to meet rising costs, and is now \$12 for regularly employed persons and \$15 for persons serving without compensation. Enactment of S. 1297 will provide the same per diem rate to the members of the Board as applies to others serving without compensation.

The legislation was requested by the Department of the Interior.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1297) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 891), is amended by changing the proviso in the last sentence to read as follows: "Provided, That each Commissioner shall be paid per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at a rate that does not exceed the rate authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 808), as heretofore or hereafter amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), to be paid to persons serving without compensation."

SEC. 2. The limitation on the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board that is contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685, 699), is repealed.

REVOCATION OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY FARM RESERVE ON THE LAC DU FLAMBEAU RESERVATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 125, Senate bill 1298.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1298) to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole and part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report on Senate bill 1298 from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The purpose of S. 1298, introduced by Senator CHURCH as the result of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior, is to permit the Secretary to revoke

in part or in entirety the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation in Wisconsin.

This legislation is necessary because the act of May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. 132), reserved approximately 700 acres of land in certain designated sections of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation for a school and agency farm.

Portions of this reserve have already been conveyed by act of Congress to the diocese of Superior for church purposes and to the town of Flambeau for cemetery purposes. While the Bureau of Indian Affairs still needs for administrative purposes about 15 acres of the remainder, the balance is no longer needed and can, under the bill, be restored to its prior status of tribal land. It will then be subject to regulations that are applicable to such land. The bill is so drawn that if the 15 acres, or any part of them, become surplus, they can also be removed from reserve status.

The committee understands there are no Government-owned improvements on that portion of the reserve which is currently excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The communication from the Department of the Interior, dated January 5, 1961, requesting enactment of this legislation follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. January 5, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 3 of the act of May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. 132), reserves from allotment or other disposition, "for the school and agency farm," the unappropriated land in designated sections of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation.

A part of this school and agency farm reserve has been conveyed to the diocese of Superior for church purposes pursuant to the act of May 9, 1958 (72 Stat. 106). Another part of the reserve has been conveyed to the town of Flambeau for cemetery purposes pursuant to the same act. Both conveyances provided for a reversion to the United States in trust for the band when the land is no longer used for the specified purposes.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs presently needs for administrative purposes three tracts with a total acreage of 15.22 acres. The balance of the reserve is no longer needed for administrative purposes, but the unneeded portion cannot be removed from the reserve by administrative action because the reserve was established by statute.

The enactment of the enclosed draft of a bill will permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke the reserve with respect to the lands that are no longer needed for administrative purposes. The lands will revert to their prior status of tribal land and be subject to the usual laws and regulations that are applicable to other tribal lands.

Under the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1057), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the band any improvements on the reserved land of the band that are no longer needed by the Secretary for the administration of Indian affairs.

If the proposed legislation is enacted, the Department plans to revoke the part of the reserve that is no longer needed for administrative purposes. The band is now leasing to the Simpson Electric Co. a portion of this land together with the buildings located thereon. That company has an on-the-job

training contract with the Department, and since 1957 a total of 60 Indians have entered training there. Of that total, 39 have completed training, 11 are still in training, and 10 have discontinued training.

The Lac du Flambeau Band consists of about 1,105 persons and the reservation contains about 18,272 acres of allotted land in a trust status and 25,420 acres of tribal land. The Bureau of Indian Affairs maintains no agency there but does keep there a few employees for local forestry administration.

The Bureau of the Budget on December 30, 1950, advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

On March 3, 1961, the Secretary of the Interior wrote the chairman of the committee as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This will supplement our letter of February 14, 1961, regarding a review of the legislative materials that were submitted to Congress by this Department before January 20, 1961.

"We have completed our review, and we concur in the comments and recommendations made by the prior administration with respect to the following proposed bills and introduced bills:

"INDIANS

"5. Proposed bill, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

"Sincerely yours,

"STEWART L. UDALL,

"Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before this measure is passed, may I say that S. 54, S. 1297, and S. 1298 have the approval of both the preceding Republican administration and the present Democratic administration. All these bills have been cleared by the minority, and they approve taking them up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of S. 1298.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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 of May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. 132), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The reserve established by this section for school and agency farm purposes may be revoked in whole or in part by the Secretary of the Interior when the land is no longer needed for such purposes, and the lands so removed from reserved status shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to other lands of the band."

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY: FASCIST GROUP

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I commend three of my distinguished colleagues for bringing to the attention of the Senate, and the public, ugly facts concerning the fake patriots controlling the John Birch Society.

In my opinion, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] have performed an important public service by exposing the true character of the society.

I join them in their contempt for leaders of this vicious organization.

I assert the John Birch Society is a Fascist group. It is well larded with rightwing crackpots. It is an ideological abomination, and the self-appointed vigilantes who are its leaders deserve the disdain and scorn of every American who values his democratic heritage.

Unfortunately, these radicals of the right in the so-called Birch Society in many communities have been practicing character assassination without regard for the truth, threatening merchants with boycotts, threatening college professors and school principals with dismissal. They spread fear, hatred and suspicion. They are even proposing infiltration in such fine, worthwhile civic organizations as the Parent-Teachers' Association.

The little Hitler who commands the John Birch Society already has written his own version of "Mein Kampf." From all reports, it is a psychotic collection of hate, slander and demagoguery.

This "fuehrer," Robert H. Welch, Jr., of Massachusetts, flatly states, "Democracy is a perennial fraud."

He has impugned many of our most respected leaders, among them our great Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren, who has been accused by Welch of not supporting the Constitution—of giving aid and comfort to enemies of the American way of life. Welch has demanded his impeachment. A leader of the society even suggested that the Kremlin should award the Order of Lenin to Chief Justice Warren for serving the cause of communism. Followers who have been duped by this demagog, Welch, have written their Senators urging impeachment of the Chief Justice.

That anyone should propose impeachment of this great American or imply in any way that he is disloyal, is ridiculous and outrageous.

Yet, I have received mail—clearly inspired by the John Birch Society—demanding that we Senators institute impeachment proceedings against Chief Justice Warren.

One letter warned:

You will never get another vote of mine or anyone I know if you approve of Earl Warren's record.

Frankly, I would never want that crackpot's vote. Another charged Earl Warren is guilty of treason, and still another urged immediate impeachment "before he has the opportunity to sell us all out."

Mr. President, I am ashamed to read letters like this from fellow Americans. I am ashamed because these people, who unfortunately have been deceived by unscrupulous leaders, would destroy our rich heritage under the guise of protecting it.

An answer typical of those I am making to constituents demanding the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren is:

Some crackpot has given you false information or you are the recipient of utterly false information from some organization guilty of distributing false propaganda for mercenary motives.

That anyone should propose impeachment of Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren is ridiculous and outrageous.

Some years ago Earl Warren was a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination and that party's nominee for Vice President of the United States. During recent years the Supreme Court of the United States, over which he presides, has won universal acclaim by its integration and other decisions.

It is unfortunate you read such trash regarding an outstanding American and that you have been deceived.

Using the convenient cover of patriotism, members of the John Birch Society would crucify democracy itself, and crush the precious rights and liberties we cherish.

I assert, Mr. President, that smashing democracy is an illogical way to fight internal communism, and I charge that the leaders of the John Birch Society are dangerously Fascist-minded or viciously demagogic or stupid, in presenting their program as one designed to save America. There is more to being an American than simply denouncing so-called Communists in America. The Communist Party in this country is such a minute splinter group, it numbers fewer than 1,000—probably less than 500—in Ohio.

In my judgment, the Fascist John Birch Society, and others like it, are as serious a threat to our security and way of life as internal communism.

We live in a grim period of international anarchy. This Nation is in a war economy. Communist Russia and Red China threaten the peace of the world. It is amazing to me that in the face of the grave Communist menace from overseas, some of our good citizens shrug that off and imagine they see Communists under beds here in our country. Their hullabaloo about a Communist apparatus in Washington or Cleveland or San Francisco or Chicago, seeking to overthrow our Government by force and violence, reminds me of the couplet:

Last night I saw upon the stair
A little man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today;
Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

Many Americans have always been reluctant to admit the existence of a disturbingly large group of Fascist-minded people in our own country. We regard as grotesque the Know Nothing political movement of a century ago.

As the Presiding Officer [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is a student of history, will recall, the leaders of the Know Nothing movement in the United States opposed immigration and immigrants, particularly Irish immigrants, and even claimed that the Pope was coming here to America to establish a Vatican somewhere along the Mississippi. Political agitators of 1854, who had not been nominated by either of the leading political parties, were elected to high office. This Know Nothing movement elected members of

Congress and influenced others. It had as its presidential candidate in 1856 a former President of the United States, Millard Fillmore.

Then, in the 1930's in the form of the Nazi bund and the lunatic fringe who clustered around Gerald L. K. Smith and other American Fascists, there was a resurgence of this un-American activity.

Now here we are again, and today's spokesmen of fascism in America are leaders of the John Birch Society.

They are the know-nothings of the 20th century, prophets of hatred who spread lies and foment suspicion and who would undermine the very foundations of our democracy.

Mr. President, there may be a tendency among many Americans to scoff at this Fascist group and to view it as a temporary phenomenon. This might be foolish—in fact, dangerous—for the John Birch Society is well-financed and should not be ignored.

The "fuehrer," Robert H. Welch, is a millionaire and apparently he is adding to his personal wealth by the promotion of the John Birch Society.

The society numbers in its leadership ranks many industrialists, retired high military officers, and former presidents and board members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Robert H. Welch, head of the John Birch Society, failed when he sought to be the Republican nominee for Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts in 1950. He is succeeding handsomely in selling life memberships in his society for \$1,000 each and raking in thousands of dollars every month in members' dues—\$24 a year for men and \$12 a year for women. Very specifically, he stated that he, as leader, would not give an accounting to the members or to anyone else.

They believe that by identifying themselves as "anti-Communists" they can expand their membership.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, only last week warned against vigilante action in the fight against communism. He said:

The job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen.

Without a doubt, it is legal for a man to be a Fascist—if he wishes to be that stupid—and to express opinions no matter how distorted, fantastic, and extreme they may be. Robert Welch, who founded this John Birch Society and conceived the idea of having small cells in various places, made the demagogic and false utterance that General Eisenhower at the time he was President of the United States was a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

Think of that, Mr. President.

The most amazing thing is that an educated man would say this and it is equally fantastic that there are some deluded followers who believe it. Nevertheless, we concede that any mercenary demagog has a right to express his opinions though distorted, unfounded, and false.

Mr. President, I am less concerned about the existence of possibly 500 or

1,000 Communists in my own State of Ohio—and certainly no more than 30,000 in the United States—than I am about the ugly boil of fascism which leaders of the John Birch Society represent.

In my State of Ohio, it is estimated that there are fewer than 1,000 Communists—more nearly 500. In the Nation, Communists at the most form one-twentieth of 1 percent of our entire population, according to Professor Chaffee, in the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors.

The bulletin was issued some years ago. In this era of prosperity and hope, there are no doubt fewer.

The odds are 1,999 to 1 in favor of free institutions. Suppose at the Cleveland Indian opening game later this month the Cleveland Municipal Stadium is filled with 40,000 people. The chances are that 20 of them might be Communists, and 39,980 would not. Do we need the John Birch Society to help protect us, who outnumber them 2,000 to 1—who have also the Cleveland and State police, the FBI, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, never forgetting the Marines?

We can hope, Mr. President, that as more becomes known of this shadowy band, its activities and philosophy will have the exact opposite effect than that for which its leaders strive. Indeed, I predict that in time these Fascists will discredit themselves and the cause they stand for and in that way make a contribution to the principles of democracy which they oppose.

In a minority opinion by Justice Hugo Black, concurred in by Chief Justice Warren, is this important sentence which we should all remember:

Liberty, to be secure for any, must be secure for all—even the most miserable merchants of hatred and unpopular ideas.

Robert H. W. Welch and other Fascist-minded leaders of the John Birch Society are seeking to rescind and repeal the 20th century.

Their Mussolini—their chief promoter—il duce or fueher, Robert H. W. Welch, is a fake patriot—a slick demagog proposing dangerous nonsense. His society, like the Know Nothing party of 105 years ago, may live a little while and then be gone with the wind, and, like the Know Nothing party, will pass away unwept, unhonored, and unsung. At the moment it is an irritation in our American way of life.

As busy as we are in the Senate and as busy as are Members of the other body, I know of no valid reason for any congressional investigation of this Fascist group.

THE B-70 PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, mistaken judgment is a costly exercise when it applies to our defensive or offensive posture. For example, when the decision was made in Casa Blanca in World War II that we would fight to an unconditional surrender, we set up a situation that prolonged that costly war. When Hitler, in the early part of that same war, decided to slow down the production of fighter planes and concentrate on bombers, so that he could have the

satisfaction of personal vengeance on England, he undoubtedly created a situation that proved to be one of the major reasons for Germany's defeat.

I do not question the sincerity or the patriotism of those who advise that the B-70 program be cut back, but this decision has been made, and I am hopeful, that the President, in his judgment, will restore these cuts and failing in that, I suggest that it would be the responsibility of the Congress to see that this action is taken.

This weapon contains all of the advantages of the Polaris submarine, plus speed, maneuverability, and, as of now, and of the date of its completion, no known enemy capability to shoot it down. Wars are going to be fought by men—not by black boxes—so it is imperative that America have this most modern of all weapons, and have it completed and quickly.

Our President has indicated a desire that is shared by all, I am sure, that we develop a transport aircraft in this country capable of speed above the sonic barrier. As of today, we have nothing in the factories, and nothing on the drawing boards, for a transport that will travel at speeds exceeding Mach 1.

I suggest that if the President wishes this kind of transport, instead of allocating, as I understand, \$10 million for research on such project, that he push the B-70 program, because we have the air frame, and the aeronautical breakthrough that will give us Mach 3 flight, or three times the speed of sound, which can be applied not only to this aircraft as a weapon, but in peaceful uses for a transport. I hope that a decision, by either the President himself, or by this body, will be made quickly to restore these cuts, because in the judgment of this particular Senator, this cut-back is a very costly mistake to be made at this time when we cannot afford to make mistakes in the cold war, or in any hot war that we have coming.

RECOGNITION OF APRIL 15 OF EACH YEAR AS AFRICA FREEDOM DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 118) favoring the recognition of April 15 of each year as Africa Freedom Day, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the emergence of Africa into the forum of world affairs is one of the most significant developments of this period of history; and

Whereas on the African Continent new and independent countries are being born with great rapidity; and

Whereas at the first Conference of African Independent States convened in Ghana in April of 1958, the then eight free nations of the continent called for the observation on April 15 of Africa Freedom Day until all Africa is free; and

Whereas this call to the world was reiterated by the All African People's Conference held in Ghana in December 1958; and

Whereas the peoples of Africa are sympathetic to the ideals of democracy espoused by the free world, and look for friendship and assistance from the United States; and

Whereas our American tradition of freedom and independence makes us sympathetic to the desire of all people for self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that April 15 of each year should be recognized as Africa Freedom Day; and that we urge the President on that date each year to send a special message of good will to the independent countries of Africa.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the resolution relates to African Freedom Day. Perhaps the most remarkable event in the political history of the last decade and a half, particularly in the last 5 years, has been the increasingly rapid transformation of a majority of Europe's African dependencies into new independent states.

In fact, today the Vice President of the United States is the official representative of this Government at the independence celebration of the new African nation and State of Senegal. Vice President JOHNSON represents our Nation at this very important event and occasion. I know that he will do so with distinction, great honor, and credit both to himself and to our country.

The division of Africa among foreign powers that began with European mercantile expansion in the 16th century and reached its zenith in the period between the unification of Germany and the Second World War has now come to the end. Indeed, by the beginning of this year the areas still under European control had diminished until they represented less than half of Africa in number and population.

Since World War II Morocco, Tunisia, Guinea, the Cameroun Republic, Togo, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Republic of Congo—Brazzaville—Dahomey, Gabon, the Ivory Coast, Malagasy, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Upper Volta have all gained their independence from France. During this same period, Britain relinquished its colonial rule in Ghana—including the British Togo Trust Territory—Nigeria, and the Sudan, which it had administered under a condominium with Egypt; in addition, Sierra Leone, will become an independent member of the Commonwealth on the 27th of this month, April; the British North and South Cameroons Trust Territories have just completed a referendum on their future as parts of other independent countries, and independence for the British Trust Territory of Tanganyika is scheduled for December 28 of this year. Libya and Somalia, former Italian colonies, have also gained their independence after limited periods of U.N. trusteeship, and the former British colony of Somaliland has been united with Somalia. Lastly, Belgium acceded to the demand for independence for its Congo colony last summer although unfortunately the events which followed in the wake of independence have created difficulties which have yet to be resolved.

I would add that I am confident of their resolution, however. There appears to be an improvement in the situation in the Congo, primarily due, may

I say, to the close cooperation of the freedom-loving nations in the United Nations, with particular reference to the cooperation between the United States and India. I believe that these two countries have done a great deal to restore a degree of order, and the possibility of a firm resolution of the problems that beset the economy.

By 1958 it became evident to the first few independent African countries that their continent soon would be freed from foreign control. To support independence movements in territories still subject to the European powers and to develop common policies on many issues, the then free states, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, the Sudan, and Tunisia, convened a Conference of Independent African States in Accra, Ghana, in April of that year. The Conference designated April 15 of every year as African Freedom Day until the entire continent should be free. Later in the same year the All-African People's Conference, which brought together representatives of African political parties, unions, and sympathizers from all territories, enthusiastically supported the concept of Africa Freedom Day.

In response to the aspirations of members of both Conferences, as well as the U.S. historical support of freedom and democracy throughout the world, I introduced a resolution in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, resolving that it was the sense of the Senate that "April 15 of each year be recognized as Africa Freedom Day" and that "the President on that date each year send a special message of good will to the independent countries of Africa."

The events of the last 2 years, since this resolution was first introduced, have, indeed, been amazing. More than twice the number of independent states that first called for an Africa Freedom Day have appeared in this period. Recently the United States has demonstrated by its votes in the United Nations and by the statements of its officials that it will effectively back anticolonialism despite any hurt feelings of its allies. Under these circumstances, it seems particularly appropriate that the U.S. Senate should support a resolution marking the celebration of Africa Freedom Day.

I believe one of the great days in American foreign policy came in the recent session of the United Nations, when our Government broke with the past and joined with those who seek the freedom of every single colony; and in the instance of the vote on Angola, difficult as that vote was in the light of our close relationship with Portugal as an ally in NATO, when the representative of the United States in the Security Council and in the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, cast the vote of this country to permit the United Nations to examine into the situation in Angola. I believe this was the turning point in American foreign policy relating to the African, Asian, and Latin American areas, proving, once again, that we mean everything we have said in behalf of self-determination, freedom, and independence. This was a very difficult decision in the light of our allies and our com-

mitments to them, but it was the right decision. In matters of American foreign policy, it appears to me that virtue, right, and moral position were very important.

The significance of the original designation of African Freedom Day by the first Conference of African Independent States in 1958 is still alive today. Though most of the vast continent of Africa is free, there still are sizable areas which are not free and which have no immediate prospects for independence.

Because these areas still exist, particularly where the colonial rulers do not yet feel the winds of change or are preparing to struggle against them, the liberty of all of us is a little less secure—our stature somewhat diminished—our dignity somewhat tarnished. It is in the best interests of the United States, both politically and morally, to support the independence of the peoples of Africa. And we can make no better, more symbolic, start than to pass this resolution which I offer again today calling for our recognition of April 15 of each year as Africa Freedom Day.

I know that frequently we are told by those who claim to be very prudent, wise, and sagacious that those resolutions are but window dressing and do very little, if any, good. In fact, there are always those who exercise the prerogatives of being very overcautious—in the development of what we call foreign policy. I suggest that the best thing for this country to do is to interpret its spirit to the world in tangible evidence such as resolutions and in concurring in what we know to be the desire of the American people; namely, freedom for people. The duty of representative government is to represent the true will of the people, not the will of merely a handful who feel that they are interpreting the will of the people. There is not a single residue of colonialism in the United States. There is no interest on the part of the American people in it. In fact, the American people find colonialism to be repugnant.

I suggest that the best thing our Government can do is what it is now doing; namely, to take the timely steps which are required to place this Government on record in support of freedom, independence, and self-determination. This is exactly what we mean by protecting human dignity.

I compliment the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Stevenson, our representative in the United Nations, for the courageous and timely action which has been taken in recent weeks in the United Nations and in reference to the official statement of our Government.

It is indeed highly significant that the Vice President of the United States should be on this day visiting Africa to give witness, again, to the American desire for close cooperation with the peoples of Africa, and our profound respect for their freedom and their independence. I know the Vice President will be well received and that he will convey the greetings and the true feelings of the people of the United States.

While I mention the Vice President, let me say that despite all the editorial

criticism and some of the commentary in the press relating to the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. Williams, on his trip to Africa, he performed outstanding service for this country. He did so in the sense that he represented the genuine spirit of the American people to the nations and the peoples whom he visited. Yes; he may have made an inappropriate remark in terms of what some persons think is appropriate; but I suggest that Mr. Williams spoke the heart of the American people when he went to the peoples of Africa and said that we were with them, and that we wanted them to build their own destiny. The peoples of Africa, as Mr. Williams pointed out, are not merely the Negro people or the Africans themselves, but also other settlers who wish to live there in peace, security, and independence. Mr. Williams was speaking for them, as well. However, I suggest that it may be simply one of the favorite political games of this country to attack a man of the stature and of the background of the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; but it does not help our foreign policy. Mr. Williams was speaking well and was carrying the message of the Government of the United States. I think he is to be commended.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to make a few observations relating to an action which took place in the Senate last week which was very disturbing to me, namely, the action of the committee of conference on the third supplemental appropriation bill for 1961. I am a junior member of the Committee on Appropriations. I lay no claim to any special knowledge as to the work of that committee or to any prerogatives over and above those of any one Senator. However, I was very much concerned over the final conference report. I am afraid that that final conference report may very well leave the administrative or executive branch of the Government with inadequate resources to do the work which Congress in previous action has directed the executive branch to perform.

As reported from the conference, the third supplemental appropriations bill for 1961, H.R. 5188, provided total appropriations of \$1,694,055,637. The budget estimate was presented to Congress was \$5,339,565,127. This was the considered judgment of the Bureau of the Budget concerning the financial needs of the Government under existing legislation passed by previous Congresses and commitments made by the Government of the United States through their elected representatives up until June 30 of fiscal 1961.

Of the budget estimate figure \$5,339,565,127, the House allowed \$803,506,119. One of the reasons for that was, of course, that certain figures were not available for the House at the time of their early hearings.

The Senate allowed \$4,637,419,970. That was the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the U.S. Senate itself on the third supplemental appropriations bill.

The principal difference between the administration's request and the action of Congress, as well as between the actions of the House and Senate, was in funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The administration had requested the restoration of the impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as well as the reimbursement for current costs of the special milk program, the International Wheat Agreement, emergency famine relief, the Public Law 480 program, the migratory waterfowl feed program, bartered material for stockpiles, grading and classing activities, and long-term supply contract losses. Every one of those items has been legislated by Congress. We had directed by legislative enactment the fulfillment of the Government's responsibility under those laws.

The estimate of \$2,969,525,000 for these items had not been considered in the House. The Senate approved \$2,820,307,000, but the House conferees refused to agree even to a compromise amount, and the entire amount was deleted.

We are not permitted under the rules of this body to make any unkind or unfavorable remarks relating to the respective Chambers of the legislative branch, and I shall abide by the rules. I simply say that the failure of the committee of conference to bring back a compromise figure has left the executive branch in a very difficult situation in terms of the administration of some of these programs. This is particularly true with respect to the special milk program for our children and in terms of the famine relief program or the area of the program for food for the distressed areas of the Nation.

I suppose that by taking moneys away from programs which may be less urgent, it might be possible to fulfill some of the emergency obligations. But this is a poor way to run a government, and particularly a poor way to operate programs which are not the special prerogatives of the executive branch but rather are the required programs of the legislative branch.

Of the remainder of the budget request, a total of \$2,370,040,127, Congress approved \$1,694,055,637. Of the \$675,984,490 difference between these two figures, \$555,615,500 represented a cut in the \$1,080,397,000 requested for the Department of Labor. The major portion of this was in the requested payment to the Federal extended compensation account, where the estimate was reduced by \$490 million.

Simply put, Mr. President, that was the reduction in the funds for temporary unemployment compensation. After all, the temporary unemployment compensation account relates to unemployment which has taken place in the past year or the preceding years; and it ought to be paid within this fiscal year, instead of playing games with the bookkeeping of the Government.

Of the \$150 million requested for the Development Loan Fund, which the House had disapproved entirely, and the Senate had voted to restore, \$50 million was approved in conference. The conference directed, however, that these funds were to be earmarked specifically for loans in the Western Hemisphere.

Of course, Congress can do whatever it wishes; and it has done so. But there was adequate testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and, indeed, there was argument here in the Senate itself, in regard to the need for the \$150 million for the Development Loan Fund. At the very time when Soviet Russia is exerting pressure all over the world, at the very time when we are facing the greatest threat to our security that we have ever known, we have decided to cut back the Development Loan Fund—the fund for the making of loans which are repayable with interest—despite the testimony which indicated that these funds are required and, in fact, were committed in August of last year. In fact, last August the Development Loan Fund Administrator was asked to return to the Congress, after January, to obtain the funds which might be required. Assurance was given that such funds would be made available. The Senate did vote to make them available. I simply say that I have a feeling that between now and June 30 we shall encounter trouble with this program; and if we do, I want the record clear as to why the trouble besets us. These programs cannot be operated without the required resources. The \$150 million was the Eisenhower request, and it was the Kennedy request. It was the basic minimum. Even that was less than one-third of the amount required for the loans which already were in process. It was barely enough for the general authority under minimum standards. I am afraid we may very well encounter serious difficulties because of this particular action.

The estimate of \$6 million for Federal payment to the District of Columbia, which had been entirely disallowed by the House, and had been restored by the Senate in the form of a \$5,700,000 Federal loan to the District, was deleted in conference. Let me say that that action by the Senate was taken at the suggestion of the able and dedicated Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations. I thought the Senator from West Virginia made a very practical suggestion. He is a frugal and prudent man. He is not a spender. He has had years of experience in Congress with appropriations matters. However, in the conference that loan authority was deleted, and no funds at all were provided.

At the present time the Nation's Capital has pressing needs for new school buildings and for a host of public works projects. However, today the Capital of our country finds itself without funds with which to carry on those projects, and it is unable to commit moneys to those programs. It is said there will be a sales tax, and that it will provide the necessary revenues. But that tax will

take effect in the future; the enactment of a sales tax is not exactly an example of rapid action by Congress. Instead, it is what I would call delayed action. In the meantime, funds which were supposed to be made available for a limited amount of constructive programming in the field of public works are not available. I suggest that the delay will cost the taxpayers much more, because building costs are rising; equipment which should be put to work is lying idle; and unemployment exists in this city, as well as in other cities. Such a situation does not make much sense to me. In fact, I think we would be much better off by having people at work, rather than to pay them unemployment compensation. I believe it makes much more sense to have a sensible public works program for the doing of things which need to be done, rather than to pay people for doing nothing, even though they have earned, under the law, the right to be paid unemployment compensation.

As I have stated, the conference committee deleted the entire item. However, the conference committee did accept the Senate's allowance for the District of Columbia, from the regular district of Columbia funds; and that was twice the amount which had been allowed by the House. The final figure was \$10,820,619, as compared to the estimate of \$11,163,119. The House had approved \$8,636,169.

The conference committee approved more funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than had been requested. The estimate called for \$110,543,000. \$127,375,500 was appropriated. The difference resulted from the House action—in which the Senate had concurred—in adding \$29,990,000 for Federal aid to schools in impacted areas. That was a very worthy action by the House, and I think it was fully justified, and was well concurred in by our conferees.

Considerable restoration was made in the funds for independent offices. I ask unanimous consent that the figures relating to the budget estimate, the House action, the Senate action, and the conference committee action be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

| | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| Estimate..... | \$177,538,000 |
| House..... | 133,264,650 |
| Senate..... | 174,987,650 |
| Conference..... | 162,144,650 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. The funds for the Department of the Interior were cut considerably below the requests, largely by House and Senate disallowance of \$12 million for the development and operation of helium properties. I ask unanimous consent that the figures in that connection be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

| | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Estimate..... | \$27,172,000 |
| House..... | 13,395,000 |
| Senate..... | 15,151,333 |
| Conference..... | 15,057,000 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one significant reduction—on which the Senate gave in to the House—was in the funds for new construction in the national parks. The estimate was \$467,000. The House voted \$300,000. The Senate approved the entire amount of the estimate. However, the conference agreed on the figure voted by the House, which was a reduction of \$167,000. That will not cripple the program, but it will slow down the construction program for our national parks.

Mr. President, I do not know how many Members of the Senate visit the national parks; but I have stated here in the Senate that, practically every year, one of the joys of the Humphrey family is to get in the car and travel to the national parks, and see how people live, instead of just remaining in Washington and seeing how people live here. I imagine that when the Senate takes a limited recess, such as it is taking now, very few of our colleagues visit the national parks. Instead, they visit their constituents, or they go to other places, where they can gain some rest and refreshment of their bodies and spirits. But let me say that the national parks are the people's playground, and our national parks need more development and modernization of their facilities. They are inadequately staffed. In addition, they have inadequate facilities with which to care for the growing population of our country. Sometimes I feel that if we gave a little less attention to country clubs and even to some of the elaborate and expensive types of recreation, and if we gave more attention to public parks, our country would be more beautiful.

I am suggesting that, when we come to matters like the National Park Service, we remember this is something that belongs to the people; and a little sum like \$467,000 for our national parks is surely not asking too much, particularly at a time when there is a real need to put money to work on constructive and gainful employment.

It should be noted the Senate secured conference agreement on appropriations of \$350,000 for construction by the Fish and Wildlife Service. This was in contrast to an estimate of \$214,000, and a House figure of \$200,000.

The Department of State fared fairly well. The budget estimate was \$12,636,000. The conference gave \$11,562,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, also, that the figures for the Department of State be included at this point in the Record.

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

| | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| Estimate..... | \$12,636,000 |
| House..... | 11,762,000 |
| Senate..... | 11,562,000 |
| Conference..... | 11,562,000 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be noted the Senate allowed less than the House, and the lower figure was accepted in conference.

The Department of Defense did quite well, as usual. The Department of the Army received all it had requested for civil functions, and military functions were cut only \$2 million.

The estimate was \$288,549,000, and the conference gave \$286,549,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures on the Defense Department be printed in the Record at this point.

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

| (Military functions only) | |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Estimate..... | \$288,549,000 |
| House..... | 285,549,000 |
| Senate..... | 286,549,000 |
| Conference..... | 286,549,000 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the Department of Defense, particularly the Army, was well taken care of in terms of the budget estimates. For this we can be grateful. But as long as I am expressing a note of gratitude for what we did for the Army, may I suggest it would not be a bad idea to do something for the school milk program. I cannot, for the life of me, see what has happened to values in this country. On the one hand, we respond, generally, to requests of the civil functions of the Army, which are the Army Engineers functions. It does a splendid job. I am not critical; I want to be laudatory. The Department of the Army does a good job in its civil functions. But when it comes to taking care of our national parks, food for distressed areas, special milk programs for our own children, somehow or other, we say this we cannot afford.

It does not add up, and I want the Record quite clear that I was not happy with the conference report. Despite the efforts of our Senate conferees to hold the line, the bill as finally enacted is inadequate to take care of the many pressing needs facing our people. I want to express my appreciation for the work of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee who served on the conference committee, especially our beloved chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I know they did the best they could under the circumstances, and that some of them share my disappointment over the results.

I have expressed my views today because it will be my intention, when the regular appropriations come by for the fiscal year 1962, to do what I can to restore these funds, at least where there is a demonstrable need, so that the departments of our Government can operate effectively and can fulfill the requirements of legislation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are no other Members of the majority present than the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I feel it incumbent upon me, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to give assurances to the freshman member of the Appropriations Committee, who has admitted his lack of familiarity with the procedure and the techniques used by the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations and the conference committees.

I recall that on Thursday afternoon I engaged in a colloquy, very briefly, with the Senator from Minnesota, and called to his attention the action taken by the conference committee on the third supplemental appropriation bill.

I deplore very much that, while the Senator from Minnesota makes an emotional appeal that we are ignoring these very deserving programs and depriving the children in our schools of the milk which they need for their lunches, he is greatly distorting the record. I do think that, even though he has been on the Appropriations Committee a very brief time, and that therefore we should be tolerant of these misstatements, the fact remains that we were dealing with a supplemental appropriation bill on a budget request, revised by this administration, which requested funds, not for this fiscal year, but for the next fiscal year.

The Appropriations Committee and the various subcommittees have not yet started hearings, on the Senate side, on the regular budgets for 1962; and knowing that the Senator from Minnesota is a very adroit and canny politician, as he demonstrated during the past few years in his quest for the presidential nomination of his party, obviously he knows that last week, on this floor, there was a play made to transfer funds which legitimately will be expended in the next fiscal year. This would show them as part of the fiscal year ending June 30th, and thereby charge to the outgoing Eisenhower administration much of the deficit which ordinarily would be charged to the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, we will have ample time to provide funds for all of these activities. I want to remind the Senator from Minnesota that, in the recent debate on the appropriation bill, the Senator from Idaho presented a budget document, which went to the House under date of March 20, which was precisely 1 week prior to the consideration of the bill in this body—submitting revised estimates for many of these programs. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that when I called attention to this House document and offered a series of amendments, I reduced the appropriation by exactly \$149,218,000. There was no roll call, because the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the chairman of the subcommittee on the agricultural budget, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], accepted the amendments because they were based upon a budget request submitted by this administration.

Mr. President, I do not want to belabor this subject, but I do think it is most unfortunate, when this administration and the majority party control this body with a membership of approximately two to one, and likewise control the Appropriations Committee of the Senate by a ratio of 17 majority members to 10 minority members—it certainly becomes apparent that the responsibility rests fully upon the majority Members of this body—that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota undertakes to lecture the Members of this body and to denounce considerations on the part of the House in handling this appropriation bill. I submit, Mr. President, that he is then denouncing vigorously the members of his own party and leadership in the White House, and the leadership of which he

is a part in the Senate of the United States.

Appeals are frequently made for unanimity and cooperation in handling the public business.

Certainly it would be in order for the distinguished majority whip to come forward with clean hands to commend the action taken by this body and by the conferees representing the House, and to point out that not only is it desirable at times to spend more Federal money but also that we should constantly be alert to the need for greater economy and efficiency in the operations of the Federal Government so that we can curtail our appropriations and expenditures and retard inflationary influences which are devastating to the security and to the welfare of our country.

WEATHER—TAKE IT OR MAKE IT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last week there was held in the city of Washington, D.C., a National Water Symposium. This symposium was called by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and by the National Reclamation Association. The sessions lasted 3 days. They brought together people who, in an official or in a private capacity, have been concerned with water problems, ranging from those which affect the farmer on the land to those which affect the person living in a large city.

If anything were needed to emphasize the conclusion of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources that water today is a national problem, the papers presented at the water symposium supplied the emphasis. I hope at a later date to present for inclusion in the Record some of the significant papers which were presented.

Among the speakers was the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd Dominy. A paper was presented in behalf of General Itschner, the Chief of Army Engineers, by Major General Cassidy. Papers were presented by heads of departments of various universities throughout the country and by people who are connected with the research institutions, both private and public.

The first session was devoted to assessing the need. The sessions of the second day were devoted to measuring the need and to consideration of what is being done in nonirrigated agriculture. The sessions of the third day were devoted to problems related to irrigated agriculture.

At the concluding session on Friday, it was my privilege to be one of the speakers. I discussed the methods of measuring the allocation of water for various needs under the concept of multiple use.

Members of the Congress were given the honor of opening certain sessions. The first session was opened by a talk by Mr. Ted Schad, who is not a Member of Congress but who was the director of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources.

The second session was opened by an address by the Senator from Oklahoma

[Mr. KERR], the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources.

Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presented the opening paper at the morning session of the second day.

At the afternoon session, a paper was presented by the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations.

In my paper I sought to deal somewhat with the need for allocating water. I pointed out that we live in a very dynamic country. An estimate of the needs of today will not necessarily measure accurately what will be the need 10 years from now. Nevertheless, I presented the current estimate to show the likely change in water requirements.

The estimate of the Select Committee on Water Resources is very revealing in this respect. It indicates that whereas the need for running water in streamflow for the production of hydroelectric power will almost triple between 1960 and the year 2000, the need for flowing water for navigational purposes will decrease somewhat in that same period of time. The need for water as a means to help control pollution will increase; and the need for flowing water, and water resources generally, for recreation and as a habitat for sport fishes will also increase during the next 40 years.

Because of the need we have to consider the various ways to increase the water supply. I devoted a part of my remarks to reviewing the progress which is being made in regard to desalinization of water, both ocean water and inland brackish waters.

I also spoke of the need for stepping up research in cloud modification. In particular I called attention to the possibilities in the interior parts of the country of using rockets to provide a mechanism by which the nucleating agent might be put into the clouds. I pointed out the difference between pertinent problems on the West coast and those in the Great Plains. On the West coast there are moisture-laden clouds coming in from the ocean which strike the mountains, creating an updraft, so that the vapor released from ground generators can be carried into the clouds. The situation in the Midwest and in the Great Plains is that the cold winds come from the northwest and strike the moisture-laden warmer winds from the south, passing under the warmer winds. In fact, I think that has been the reason why the attempt to use ground generators for carrying nucleating agents into the clouds has not been successful in the Great Plains area. The warm air rises, and the crosscurrents between the ground and the moisture-laden clouds do not permit the vapor generated from ground generators to reach the clouds.

On the other hand, there have been dramatic results in the Great Plains when aircraft were used and the nucleating agent, whether silver iodide or dry ice, was dumped directly into the cloud.

Mr. President, the Advisory Committee on Weather Control made its final report to the President on December 31, 1957. This two-volume report is still the most authentic and complete report on weather modification in existence. The committee was not authorized to do research but to evaluate the work being conducted by both private and public agencies, studying all the available literature on the subject, and then to make recommendations to the President as to what should be done to strengthen the program.

The committee found that more basic information was needed about the atmosphere and its behavior. They recommended, among other things, that basic and applied research was of prime necessity and should be enlarged without delay. They recommended that the research program be sponsored by the Government primarily through work with Federal agencies, universities, and colleges, industries, and other organizations.

Following the issuing of that report, I introduced a bill proposing such an expanded program. It was concluded to be advisable, after hearings, to place the program in the hands of the National Science Foundation.

The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted hearings on the bill. It was subsequently passed by the Senate, approved by the House, and signed by President Eisenhower. The law gave the National Science Foundation the responsibility for developing a further research program. With the limited funds available for this purpose, the foundation has done a creditable job, but the possibilities in this field warrant a more vigorous program.

In 1959, the total Federal Government expenditure for support of scientific research and development was approximately \$7.4 billion. There was appropriated by the Congress to all agencies of the Government some \$36 million for meteorological research.

I daresay, Mr. President, that when the long span of history takes a look at what we do today, it will say the \$36 million for meteorological research had much greater significance for the welfare of mankind than the \$7.4 billion devoted generally to research and development. Research in the fields of weather and of water improvement and expansion of water resources offers more potential benefit for the welfare of mankind than does a great deal of the money being spent to develop methods for the destruction of mankind.

Mr. President, if we are to meet our own needs and to maintain our lead in meteorology among countries of the world, a greatly accelerated meteorological program must be instituted.

A very outstanding address was given in January by Adm. Luis de Florez, retired, U.S. Navy Reserve, at the 29th annual meeting of the Institute of the Aerospace Sciences that covers the need for research and the need for encouraging young men to enter the field of meteorology. His discussion under the title "Weather—Take It or Make It," should be of interest to everyone.

I request unanimous consent that the address by Admiral Florez be printed in the RECORD.

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

WEATHER—TAKE IT OR MAKE IT
(By Adm. Luis de Florez)

It is strange, indeed, that the American people—who live on the assumption that any problem can be solved if you have the intelligence to define it and the will to keep working at it—display the same fatalism and resignation about the weather that our remote ancestors did thousands of years ago. It is a fact, nevertheless, for when it comes to weather, we accept whatever comes passively, patiently, as an act of the Gods. We do not seem to realize that the problem of weather control, gigantic as it is, can be subjected to the same sort of attack which brought about our great discoveries in the fields of flight, nuclear power, chemistry, medicine, and others. In any case, we have not tackled the control of weather with the same determination and audacity that we have shown in harnessing nature in other ways.

It is my growing conviction that the only real obstacle in the way of controlling the weather is our attitude of mind which appears to be a combination of three things:

1. A lack of sense of proportion concerning what is important to our existence.
2. A form of mental block bequeathed us by countless generations of peoples awed and cowed by the elements and powerless to anything other than protect themselves against them.
3. Incomplete realization of the tremendous advances and power of science and technology of our time.

At this period in our history when we are bending every effort to conquer space and solve the great problems of space travel, we seem to have bypassed any serious thought of reshaping our own atmospheric conditions which vitally affect our existence in our own home grounds.

SINGLE GREATEST FACTOR

I do not imply that we should curtail our space programs in any way, but I do mean that our atmospheric conditions constitute the greatest single factor controlling the existence of life on earth, and that reshaping the conditions of inner space to our own advantage should accompany the attempts to master outer space.

Man—and countless other forms of life—breathes the atmosphere, feeds on the products that grow in it, and conforms to the climate it produces.

The incredibly complex movements of the atmosphere, caused by the absorption of solar energy and rotation of our globe, determine, in the main, our weather and our climates. In turn, our climates and weather determine the living conditions which affect life itself, the evolution of species, and the characteristics of peoples.

Only man, out of all species of life, has learned to adapt himself artificially to all kinds of weather. He has discovered fire, invented clothing, habitations, refrigeration, and pressurization—in short—everything he has needed to exist anywhere on the earth, and possibly beyond it. This physically weak and hairless creature has survived and populated the earth, harnessed nature's energy, and rules the animal kingdom, while many more powerful and formidable species have become extinct. Man's brilliant accomplishments, his dedication to exploration and his earnest energy, courage, and determination are often dimmed by his understandable shortcomings in accustoming himself to his newly acquired power. Let us not underrate this remarkable adolescent

of our world's species of life because he sometimes makes his mistakes in wielding his growing powers. He will become part of the weather when he seeks this goal with all his might.

It was Charles Dudley Warner, not Mark Twain, who said that everyone complained about the weather but nobody did anything about it. No doubt this quip was meant to be humorous, but it isn't so funny when a hurricane comes barreling up our east coast leaving billions of dollars of destruction in its wake, to say nothing of casualties.

When protracted droughts abort crops, decimate cattle, and wreak great losses upon our agriculture, or when prolonged rains swell our rivers and wash away homes, towns, and the soil vital for our future existence, it is a tragedy.

In 1935 the Midwest was subjected to the longest period of hot, dry summer weather in the memory of man. It saw the dust storms, the Black Blizzards—the Dust Bowl. Later, associated with this, Nebraska suffered devastating floods on the Republican River.

DROUGHT, SNOW, AND FLOODS

Again in 1936 the Midwest suffered disastrous summer drought, and in the following January and February came the longest period of sub-zero weather and the greatest snowfall ever experienced east of the Rockies. The March thaw of that year caused disastrous floods in the East and in April tornadoes raked the Southeast causing great destruction.

Dr. Gayle Pickwell, who records these facts in his book "Weather," published in 1938, comments, "One cannot experience or read about such weather without asking himself why?" That was 25 years ago and still no answer.

The question is: Can we do something about the weather besides complain about it? The answer is "Yes." This is not the isolated opinion of an old flyer and a long-time engineer but also the opinion of many scientists, professional meteorologists far more expert than I.

In 1958 the editor of Science Newsletter (Nov. 22, 1958) made a survey of professional meteorologists concerning the feasibility of weather control. Forty-two percent believed that within 10 years it will be possible to prevent hail and lightning and to increase or decrease precipitation. Forty-six percent believed that within a span of 50 years man will learn how to control tornadoes, hurricanes and squall lines. Thirty percent believed that large-scale weather patterns will be brought under control within the next 5 decades.

In 1956 Dr. John von Neumann, one of the greatest scientific minds of our time, said:

"Our knowledge of the dynamics and the controlling processes in the atmosphere is rapidly approaching a level that will make possible, in a few decades, intervention in atmospheric and climatic matters. It will probably unfold on a scale difficult to imagine at present. There is little doubt one could intervene on any desired scale, and ultimately achieve rather fantastic effects."

With intensive work all these time periods can be shortened.

Certainly we know that climates have changed and for that matter are changing. We suspect that atmospheric circulation could be changed by altering the absorption and radiation of parts of the earth's surface and we know that in so doing climate and weather would be changed. We know that we can induce precipitation by seeding clouds with dry ice, silver iodide or carbon black, and that in so doing great quantities of energy from the condensation of water vapor can be liberated. There is reason to believe that we may find triggering mechanisms which could make or dissipate atmospheric disturbances.

Some 15 years ago Irving Langmuir of the G.E. made a series of experiments in New Mexico in which he seeded the atmosphere with silver iodide generators at periodic intervals. He claimed that as a result of such seeding the weather on the east coast was observably affected. Others claimed that it was not. The controversy which arose was never settled, in spite of the far-reaching implications of such an experiment, nor was there any attempt made to repeat the experiment in order to shed light on the subject.

IS IT POSSIBLE?

The question is not who was right or who was wrong, but rather is it possible to produce long-range weather effects in this manner or, for that matter, any other way? A subject of such vital importance should never have been allowed to rest on uncertainty or on opinion.

The influence of weather control or modification on every phase of human activities beggars the imagination. Only slight improvements in precipitation or temperatures could result in making vast territories available for agriculture and normal living.

Small changes in atmospheric circulation could bring about more favorable temperatures to make additional areas suitable for human habitation. It is conceivable that hurricanes could be diverted or their force dissipated by breaking them into small disturbances before the system could gather all its destructive energy into one great storm. The yearly toll of disaster and enormous economic losses could be avoided or at least reduced by the capability of controlling or modifying the weather.

From a military standpoint the implications are even greater. With control of the weather the operations and economy of an enemy could be disrupted and by the same token we could be made to suffer enormous losses in our own economy and our military efforts crippled.

In a cold war the ability to control or modify weather would provide a powerful and subtle weapon to injure agricultural production, hinder commerce and slow down industries.

How then do we go about harnessing the weather? The answer is first to learn more about our atmosphere and its mechanisms. This calls for research and experiment, not on the present penny ante style, but on a scale commensurate with the immense benefits to be gained. This in turn calls for major expenditures to provide for scientific personnel, equipment, and the necessary educational program to create a source of competent workers for this field.

In addition, it requires support for a group of specialists whose primary objective is to apply current knowledge to the control or modification of weather as a point of departure. In spite of the meager support of meteorological research in the past, a good deal of basic work has been done by a relatively few competent and dedicated scientists. This work could begin to show tangible results if expanded and supported by experiment.

The development of mathematical weather models by means of computers and the simulation of circulation by means of water tank analogy has already provided modern tools for weather study. With more aircraft, rockets, balloons, and so forth, and personnel for observation we could arrive more rapidly at the point of full-scale experiment. We have recently launched a weather satellite which, along with others, will provide much needed information. I suspect, however, that this fortunate development was dictated more by our desire to expand our space technology than for the benefit of meteorology.

We could do some things immediately: for instance, eliminate or greatly reduce air pollution around our cities which dims sun-

light, causes poor visibility, promotes fog and increases the collision hazard at our great air terminals. Those of us who fly in and out of New York have seen the pall of smoke which blankets the area for miles on relatively calm southwesterly days. The smog of Los Angeles is largely manmade.

As an investment, the reduction in smoke and vapors would save our airlines millions a year by reducing delays, reducing hazards which we cannot price, and certainly by improving everyone's health. It has been estimated that air pollution costs our country over a billion dollars a year.

Some of our cities such as St. Louis and Pittsburgh have already made major improvements. Why not a national effort in this line?

APPROPRIATIONS INADEQUATE

The present scale of appropriations for meteorological research is pitifully inadequate for the task confronting us, and it falls far short of that needed for current operations for the collection of available new data.

We have not enough aircraft for observation, not enough personnel for the collection and analysis of data, and virtually no support for experiment.

The records show that in 1959 the total amount appropriated for meteorological research by all departments and agencies was some \$36 million. A good part of this was spent on equipment. Only about a million was directed specifically to the field of weather control or modification, despite its importance.

Contrast this sum of \$36 million with \$45 billion for a defense budget; some \$17 billion for military aviation, \$4 billion for military R. & D., \$2,500 million for the gross revenue of our commercial airlines. When even minor modification of weather could turn out to be a superweapon to enhance military strength, affect major savings to airlines, and reduce hazards and casualties to all—\$36 million is just plain peanuts.

The following table 8-A shows the budget of the various departments and agencies which support meteorological research and the amount of their support in dollars and as a percentage of their respective budgets.

I think you will agree that this is paltry support for a field of such immense opportunities.

TABLE 8-A.

| Agency | Total budget | Meteorological research support, 1959 | Percent of budget |
|---|--------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Millions | Millions | |
| Department of Agriculture | \$5,926 | \$0.9 | 0.15 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 2,723 | 1.3 | .7 |
| Department of Commerce | 471 | 1.6 | .34 |
| Weather Bureau | 452 | 1.8 | .40 |
| Department of Defense | 45,517 | 2.9 | .028 |
| Army | | 3.0 | .007 |
| Navy | | 6.8 | .17 |
| Air Force | | | |
| Total, Department of Defense | | 12.7 | |
| Department of Health, Education, and Welfare | 3,255 | .9 | .27 |
| Department of the Interior | 791 | .1 | .013 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 305 | 8.6 | 2.8 |
| National Science Foundation | 136 | 8.1 | 6.0 |
| Total | | 36.0 | |

It should be borne in mind that any increase in knowledge of our atmosphere and its existing movements will permit better forecasting which is badly needed. It

should also be borne in mind that a great deal needs to be done to make current weather information and short term forecast available to those concerned. This means more and better personnel for the Weather Bureau and better communications. There could be no better national investment.

It has been said that it would not be wise to provide more funds at this time since the number of technically qualified people in the field of meteorology is very limited.

STUDENTS NOT ATTRACTED

The answer is that so little money has been available for research in this field that young technical students seeking a career are not attracted to it in spite of the challenge it presents. Table 9-B shows the number of students graduating in various technical fields as compared to those graduating in meteorology for the year 1959. All told there were some 77,000 graduated in engineering and other technical courses and only 173 B.S.'s and 13 Ph. D.'s in meteorology. We cannot expect to improve enrollment unless we show our interest and the vital need of study in this field by providing more funds for research and experiment and prime the educational pump with educational incentives.

The question inevitably comes to mind as to what some of our less friendly contemporaries, such as the Soviets are doing in this field. Actually, we don't really know but we do know that they have capable scientists, that they have the power to direct their research efforts where their hierarchy sees fit and that they have great advantages of terrain for experiment.

TABLE 9-B.

| Course | Degree | | |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | B.S. | M.S. | Ph. D. |
| Physical sciences | 15,460 | 3,179 | 1,812 |
| Mathematics | 9,019 | 496 | 28 |
| Engineering | 38,134 | 6,753 | 714 |
| Biology | 15,149 | 2,002 | 1,045 |
| Total | 77,742 | 12,430 | 3,599 |
| Meteorology | 173 | 88 | 13 |

They have the vast reaches of the Siberian Continent for experiment and can observe results on possible changes of surface and the effects of seeding clouds and other experiment without hindrance. We know they are working on cloud physics, fog dispersal, and other meteorological projects but for the last 4 or 5 years there has been virtually no publication of experiments or results. Is it because of the lack of work in this field? It is more likely because this work has been classified and they are keeping the results to themselves.

There are those who contend that we are ahead of the Soviets in this field. They could be right, though I doubt it. But, so what? It would be a relief for once to lead the field in this vast enterprise to control weather, as we did in the nuclear field, and to use our own initiative and good sense to better our existence and protect ourselves, without requiring the goad of Russian competition.

WORLD PROBLEMS INVOLVED

We must realize that weather control or modification, like nuclear energy, involves world problems. If we change the weather in some parts of the world it will undoubtedly affect the weather in other regions. How? Research and experiment will give us the answer which we hope would produce benefits to all mankind. Nevertheless, the control of global climate and weather must eventually be tackled even though it be fraught with danger, both physical and political, in view of the pressure generated by growing population and perhaps, most

of all, because man will never stop harnessing the forces of nature to his use.

Perhaps it is a matter for the United Nations to consider. Such consideration at an early stage might conceivably avoid bitter conflicts or even war later on.

In the foregoing I have tried to bring out the importance of meteorological research in comparison with other scientific fields and the disparity in the interest and the research effort it receives. It seems time to establish a sense of proportion between the value of even limited weather control and better forecasting and the funds allocated to bring about these results. Certainly the end results deserve the same consideration as that which we gave nuclear development and should be treated as such. We have led the world in nuclear power, why not lead the world in meteorology and its application?

To confound Charles Dudley Warner and/or Mark Twain I suggest the following specific objectives as a starting point:

1. Increase the financial support of basic meteorological research from \$36 million in 1959 to \$100 million a year starting now and being prepared to increase this as circumstances permit.

2. Increase the output of Ph. D.'s in meteorological research tenfold during the next 2 years.

This could be facilitated by evincing greater interests in meteorological research and offering educational incentives.

3. Expand research in weather control from a rather restricted field of cloud physics and cloud seeding to include investigation of the dynamics of the atmosphere on a planetary scale from the standpoint of triggering mechanisms.

Scientific means to reach this objective are now at hand in simulation of the atmosphere on electronic computers and hydrodynamical models. Furthermore, much greater consideration must be given to the interaction between the atmosphere and the sea which covers nearly three-quarters of the surface of the earth. Authority for such work already exists under Public Law 85-510.

4. Accelerate exploitation of the enormous power of meteorological satellites to bring global weather systems under surveillance.

This should not be limited merely to taking photographs of clouds, but should include the use of sophisticated sensing devices for the reconstruction of three-dimensional fields of pressure and temperature on a worldwide basis.

5. Initiate studies to assess the legal, economic, and social implications of large scale weather modifications.

6. Start now.

In conclusion, then, may I urge that the American people make control of the weather equal in scope to the Manhattan district project which produced the first A-bomb.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report to the people of my State which I made of my remarks at the National Weather Symposium.

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

SENATOR FRANCIS CASE REPORTS—USING EVERY DROP OF WATER

WASHINGTON, April 3.—Last week the most important long-range news in Washington may not have been on Capitol Hill or even at the White House. It could have been the results to flow from a National Water Research Symposium sponsored jointly by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the National Reclamation Association.

With water becoming increasingly recognized as the No. 1 natural resource and the coming No. 1 problem for all parts of the country, these organizations teamed up to bring together chiefs of such agencies as Soil Conservation Service, Reclamation, Army Engineers, Agricultural Research and specialists in water supply and use from all parts of the country.

The program was divided under the general heads of "Water Supply and Management," "Use of Water in Nonirrigated Agriculture," "Use of Water in Irrigated Agriculture," and "Multiple Use of Water Resources and Equitable Allocation."

Sample of topics: Here were some of the topics by various speakers: "Surface and Ground Water Supplies," "Increase Through Weather Modification," "Saline Water Conversion," "Increase From Alpine Snowfields," "Efficient Use in Semiarid Areas," "Effect of Headwater Development," "Design of Storage and Conveyance," "Reducing Losses From Evaporation," "Municipal and Industrial Use," "Flood Control and Navigational Requirements," "Water for Recreational Use," and "Water Control on the Farm."

Following each group of topics, speakers discussed findings of recent research.

Some of the speakers: The partial list suggests the background of the speakers: D. A. Williams, administrator, Soil Conservation Service; Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation; Dwight B. Kline, U.S. Weather Bureau; Joseph Strobe, Office of Saline Water; L. B. Nelson, TVA Chemical Development; Glenn H. Beck, dean of agriculture, Kansas; Omer J. Kelley, chief of Soil and Water Management, Colorado; Robert J. Hardman, Water Supply and Control, New Jersey; Grant W. Sharpe, Forestry, Michigan; W. L. Broadhurst, High Plains Hydrologist, Texas; and Dean D. F. Peterson, Research in Water Supply, Utah.

Sessions opened with remarks by four Members of Congress. These were: Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, chairman of Senate Select Committee on Water; Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, chairman, House Interior Committee; Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman Appropriations for Agriculture; and Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, ranking minority member Public Works Committee.

Printed proceedings: The various speeches and discussions are to be printed. We will endeavor to get copies to supply requests, or at least a résumé of the talks made. If interested let us know.

I think you will be interested in this table which I presented to show the shifting stream flow requirements as forecast in the final report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources:

[In billions of gallons daily]

| Streamflow uses | 1954 | 1980 | 2000 |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Hydroelectric power..... | 374.0 | 616.0 | 635.5 |
| Navigation..... | 281.0 | 238.4 | 221.4 |
| Sport fish habitat..... | 78.0 | 171.0 | 241.4 |
| Dilution of pollution abatement..... | | 332.2 | 446.5 |

Notice the shifting requirement as between navigation and power.

"In a dynamic economy such as ours, expanding and changing not only in population and industry, but also in irrigation, power use and recreation, decisions on water use will need to be made, revised and revised again," I pointed out, "and this cannot be done once and forever by fixed formulae. Laws and formulae must respond to human needs."

On demineralizing water: In my remarks, I also called attention to the new methods and devices being developed for taking the mineral salts out of water.

In addition to the demonstrated usability of electrodialysis for reducing hard and al-

kali waters to good quality for domestic use, I mentioned the fresh water processes that are being developed through freezing and distillation.

In particular, I think that some of the distillation processes, which vaporize thin films of water and draw off this "low-heat steam" and condense it offer practical possibilities for small town and even individual farms and ranches.

Must reach the clouds: We learned the hard way in South Dakota that ground generators tossing off silver iodide mist particles were of little practical value in modifying clouds in the northern Great Plains. We failed to heed the implications of the report by the Advisory Committee on Weather Control when it pointed to the orographic (uplift effect) created by the mountains on the west coast when the moisture-laden winds struck them.

I mention this, also, in my remarks, and pointed out that the dramatic effects of cloud seeding in the plains country came only when airplanes were used to get the nucleating agent directly into the cloud. This, whether silver iodide or dry ice was used, here, or water itself in Japan, or dust in Australia.

The droplets of moisture which are carried in the atmosphere are as small as one twenty-five-hundredths of an inch. They have to grow to one one-hundred-twenty-fifths of an inch in diameter to become heavy enough to fall as rain. In nature, they grow (1) by bumping together (like fog on your windshield); or (2) by cooling to the dew point (as on the outside of your iced tea glass); or (3) by freezing into a frost crystal and picking up more moisture until they fall as snow or hail—or rain, if they fall through a warm zone.

Any seeding operation is an attempt to provide a nucleus on which the moisture particle will grow or which will produce a temperature change enough to start the warm air to rise into an atmosphere cold enough to start the formation of frost crystals, that in turn will grow and fall.

Bentonite and rockets: Recently a professor in London has found that kaolin (a form of bentonite) which has been dehydrated has a special affinity for moisture. His findings reported in Scientific American and Time have suggested to me that we should try the well-known "thirsty" quality of our western bentonite as a nucleating agent.

The suggestion I advanced to the water symposium was that we experiment by using rockets to send small bombs of bentonite to spray or shower powdered bentonite into a cloud. Forest firefighters have found that slurry of bentonite is much more effective than plain water in dousing out treetop fires. It clings. Dams are grouted and dam leaks are sealed by the expansion of water-absorbing bentonite.

So, I suspect that "thirsty" bentonite sprayed into a cloud would gather to itself enough moisture particles to start the dropping process and "milk the cloud." Only a small fraction of the moisture that makes a cloud thick enough to become dark and look like rain would need to be obtained to make the difference between a crop and a failure, or drought and grass.

Such a project would be less fantastic than splitting the atom—and might do much more good for mankind. I am trying to promote a trial of the idea.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that I made two new proposals. One related to the concentrated use of rockets as a mechanism for getting the nuclei into the clouds for the purpose of cloud modification. The second proposal related to the use of finely powdered bentonite as one of the nuclei, to

be tried along with silver iodide, dry ice, and other materials.

Bentonite is a peculiar type of clay with a great affinity for water. It is called hygroscopic. I call it simply thirsty—because it has a faculty for drawing to itself small particles of moisture until it increases in size anywhere from 5 to 13 times.

Utilized in cloud modification, bentonite, by thus increasing in size, would make the small particles of moisture in a cloud grow until they were heavy enough to fall by gravity. This is in effect what happens when rain actually falls. The particles of moisture either run together or coalesce until they are heavy enough to fall. Or, frost crystals form if the cloud is high enough and the atmosphere is cold enough to produce frost crystals. The frost crystals grow in size until the moisture falls as hail, as frost crystals, or as snow.

I submit these observations and the statements in the hope that they will commend themselves to many Members of Congress.

I conclude by saying that the possibilities for good from meteorological research offer much encouragement to those of us who believe that the prime purpose of government is to better the welfare of the people and not to destroy them. In that spirit, I commend these remarks to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel that I would be doing an injustice to the Senate if I did not make some rejoinder to what I can only term "an attack" which was leveled a moment ago by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, would the Senator agree to a quorum call?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wanted the RECORD in reference to the supplemental appropriation to include the fact that the items which relate to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which I directed most of my remarks, were items that were not given consideration by the House, simply because it did not have those items before it. They were acted upon by the Senate, and the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, approved their inclusion.

This was honorable bookkeeping. The simple fact of the matter is that in a fiscal year we ought to take care of the costs of that fiscal year. The fiscal year 1961 is exactly what the third supplemental appropriation refers to. It does not refer to any other fiscal year than fiscal 1961. The third supplemental of

fiscal year 1961 was the appropriation that was acted upon in the Senate last week. In that budget the new administration, on examination of the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation, found that there was an impairment of capital due to programs which had been authorized by the Congress and carried out by the executive branch. That impairment of capital was to be restored. Under the rules of the House, since the committee held no hearings relating to this capital impairment, it was the view of the House conferees that they could not vote for it in conference.

I merely point out that the impairment of capital still exists. A corporation, whether public or private, should not operate by draining its resources, its capital stock. The capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been impaired to the tune of more than \$3 billion. That has not been reimbursed. It will have to be reimbursed next year. In fact, right now the Commodity Credit Corporation is within \$500 million of the full utilization of its capital; and if between now and June 30 additional commodities come into the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the capital will be impaired to the full value of the capital assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I am not being partisan on this issue. I must say that one's objectivity should be greater than his partisanship. I do not believe that angry words are a substitute for fiscal understanding. We must pay these bills. The only question is when. It seems to me that the time to pay the bills is when they are due. I wish to say for the Record, and to the country, that fiscal year 1962 will have imposed upon it additional billions of dollars of unpaid bills from fiscal year 1961.

The majority party concurred in this supplemental appropriation. I am not one to refrain from criticizing my own party when I think it is wrong. I am first a citizen of America, an American, and second a partisan; and I will always keep it that way, too.

If the majority party is willing to saddle upon the first budget for which it has full responsibility, namely, fiscal year 1962, an additional \$3 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation assets that have been used in fiscal 1961, if we

are willing to take that additional responsibility, we have exceeded the bounds of what I call even prudent generosity. This we have done, and this will add to the deficit of 1962, because we cannot operate the Commodity Credit Corporation on faith, hope, and charity. Perhaps we could do a little better with charity. The other two would not help much. The Commodity Credit Corporation must be operated on the basis of sound cost accounting, in which the inventory is related to the assets that are available to pay for inventory plus storage charges.

All we did in connection with the third supplemental appropriation was to postpone the day of reckoning for the District of Columbia, for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for certain other items. All those bills were due by January 30, 1961. That was the due date. But apparently we are so hopeful and joyful these days that we thought we would have the due date extended.

That will simply mean that fiscal year 1962 will have to have a larger appropriation in order to take care of the financial integrity of the world's largest corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation. Today it stands within \$500 million of having utilized all of its assets, with heavy demands upon it for the coming months, the crop years 1961 and 1962, and the fiscal year 1962.

I do not believe that the denunciation of one Senator is the answer to a serious fiscal problem. I feel that the duty of a Senator is to reason with his colleagues and not to engage in an exercise of vitriolic comment. We need to face up to our financial responsibilities. I have always found that in private business, relating to one's own finances, and in public finances it is better to have an honest set of books. Whether one can always pay his bills or not may depend upon resources available, but we had better have an honest set of books. We would be deluding ourselves if we thought we could ignore what has happened to over \$3 billion worth of assets in this Government—in the Department of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Of course, we shall have to replace those funds because the entire agricultural price support stabilization structure depends upon it, unless we replace those funds next year, we shall put in

jeopardy the solvency of the entire Commodity Credit Corporation.

So what will we do? We will replace those funds.

By the way, we have replaced the funds before, just as we have done this year. It was brought out in the Record that there were two other supplemental appropriations relating to Commodity Credit expenditures, I believe the years were 1956 and 1958. The Record can stand corrected if those are not the two appropriate years. There were two other times when substantial sums of money were appropriated by way of supplemental appropriation by a Congress that had relatively the same obligation politically and elsewhere. One of the times was only a very few months ago, when appropriations were made, and we restored the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I speak not as a Democrat but as a citizen and as a U.S. Senator. My party will be held accountable. One of the first things to do to be a good party member is to hold one's party accountable. I am going to hope, and I am going to work for the realization of party responsibility and fiscal integrity in this Government. The only way I know to have fiscal integrity is to face up to the counting of the costs of operating the Government, and when we do so, the American people will have reason to have confidence in the fiscal stability and the monetary policies of the Government of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 3, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, on January 27, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] delivered before the Harvard Medical Society, at Boston, Mass., a speech entitled "Medical Care for the Aged." Because of the

importance of the speech and its interesting content, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(Speech by Senator BENNETT on January 27, 1961, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.)

It is good to be with you today to discuss some of the problems pertaining to medical care for the aged. It is rather an unusual situation in 1961 for someone to be coming from Washington to Harvard. The trend in

recent weeks has certainly been quite the reverse. However, I appreciate the invitation which was extended to me by Dr. Peterson to meet with you and give you some of my views on this important problem.

The problem of medical care for the aged has been with us for many years. However, the problem has only come to the forefront as a political issue during the past two Congresses. The length of the working life and the number of years an individual spends in retirement have increased tremendously since 1900. The average number of years an American male could expect to spend in the labor force increased by over 11 years between 1900 and 1961. At the same time, the number of years a male at age 20 could expect to spend in retirement increased by