serve us at all levels of education have been developed with the support of private citizens who, for a multitude of reasons, wish to provide for education through these facilities, rather than the public school system.

As public school enrollment increases in the future, State and local communities will successfully cope with it, but school enrollment in private schools also gives us interesting statistics. Between 1940 and today, the percentage of our children attending private schools has increased from 9.4 percent to approximately 15 percent. Enrollment in private schools, most of which are church-related, is increasing faster than enrollment in public schools.

With this thought in mind, one provision of the Kennedy administration proposal for Federal spending for education should be noted. It provides for distributing funds to each State in proportion to the entire school population, public and private, without allowing for the fact that the funds would not be distributed in that fashion. Incidentally, a fair and equitable distribution of funds by States has not been proposed under any Federal spending proposals. Individual States and communities would be discriminated against.

Due to the attention the private school controversy has developed, it is also pertinent to emphasize that Federal aid to private schools would be a sugar-coated pill that would eventually be detrimental to the unique nature of our private school systems. Therefore, my colleagues who claim that it is unjust not to give private schools and, therefore, private school children, a proportionate share of this proposed Federal spending are not using a valid argument, since the important thing to direct to the attention of the parents of private school children is the long-range damage that schools would suffer under Federal regimentation.

I am a Roman Catholic and received all of my education in Catholic schools. I do not wish to see the growth, effectiveness, independence, and unique features of these private schools or any other of the outstanding and flourishing private schools of the country disrupted by Federal control, which is the inevitable byproduct of Federal aid. If the private schools of the country make the mistake of being lured into accepting Federal aid, they will be destroying the individuality of the private school systems.

Any school, public or private, that accepts Federal money will sooner or later be placed in the straitjacket of a centralized federally dominated educational system in which the bureaucracy that would develop would attempt to condition students of future generations to a philosophy of complete dependence on government. It is a matter of record that nationally supported school systems in other countries have been successfully employed by the dominant political party to influence the thinking of pupils through the teachers who look to the all-powerful government for promotion and pay.

Parents of private school students, and I direct my attention especially to parents of Catholic school students, should realize that these schools will continue to flourish in our country due to understanding tax treatment by local and State authorities, and the desire of ecclesiastical authorities and parents to provide their children with religious instruction in addition to formal education.

The diabolical maneuvering here in Washington, however, is to make an empty gesture to aid private schools through the Federal aid bill. The welfare State spendthrifts in control of the administration and the Congress will then claim that they tried to help private schools and, failing to do so, settled for Federal aid to the public schools. This is pure hypocrisy since the entire religious issue has been raised to distort the education debate and facilitate the enactment of Federal aid to local public schools.

There are numerous proposals before us which will permit the expansion of local schools through a more practical distribution of taxes and would encourage the expansion of private schools through practical adjustment of income tax credits, thus easing the pressure on public school enrollment. But debate over dollars obscures the fundamental issue: Shall our schools be federally dominated?

I am confident that the American public now perceives the danger of the huge, unregulated Frankenstein that is developing in our Federal Government. America is the greatest nation in the world because we have respected the rights of individuals and the virtues of our free enterprise economy. We have maintained basic individual liberties. The struggle in the field of education is one of the most important in deciding whether our Nation will continue to achieve sound progress based on the principles of our Constitution, or whether we will be led down the fatal road to socialism.

I, for one, have confidence in the commonsense of the American public. On the merits of the case, Federal spending for education, public or private, is unsound. Please urge your Congressman to help defeat these proposals.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1961

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

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

Our Father, God, once more at the beginning of a new week's challenge—

We come unto our fathers' God,
Their rock is our salvation,
The eternal arms their dear abode,
We make our habitation.

Since Thou art our Father may we not attempt to hide our shortcomings from Thee but to overcome them and surmount them by the stern comfort of Thy healing presence.

May we find joy in the loveliness of nature, in the strength of friendship, in the conquest of difficulty, and in the compensations of service.

In all our dealings with those who walk by our side, and who are tempted even as we, may we say to them and of them the generous things which would be upon our lips if they were here no more.

Grant us the supreme satisfaction of giving our best to every task and of having faced every duty without bitterness, with charity for all and malice toward none.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 8, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 6 OF 1961 RELATING TO FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961 relates to my message of April 13, 1961, to the Congress regarding regulatory agencies and, in particular, to that portion of the message advocating the fixing of responsibility for the overall administration of multiheaded agencies in their chairmen. The reorganization plan also is in keeping with actions begun by President Truman, largely through reorganization plans, to strengthen the internal management of multiheaded agencies by making their chairmen, rather than the boards or commissions as a whole, responsible for day-to-day administration.

The first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government concluded that purely executive duties can be performed far better by a single administrative official and stated: "Administration by a plural executive is universally regarded as inefficient." Also, as a matter of sound organization, the Congress and the President should be able to hold a single official rather than a group accountable for the effective management of an agency. The reorganization plan will meet both of those needs by placing responsibility and authority for the administration of the activities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in the Chairman of the Board. By relieving the Board of day-to-day managerial functions, the reorganization plan will significantly further the ability of the Board to deal more effectively with regulatory and policy matters before it.

Action to strengthen the management of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and to relieve the Board of day-to-day operating responsibility is particularly needed because of the phenomenal growth of the Board's activities in recent years. By way of example, the number of institutions that are members of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Federal home loan bank system and subject to the Board's supervision has increased from 3,898 in 1950 to 4,552 at present. In the same period, the assets of those institutions have increased almost fivefold from $15.4 billion to $71.0 billion. In fiscal year 1950, the Board examined 2,450 institutions; in fiscal 1961, about 4,224 examinations will be conducted. The personnel of the Board have more than doubled in number in the last decade to handle the increased workload.

Pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board was made the chief executive officer of the Board, and there was transferred to him the authority to appoint and direct the personnel necessary to perform the functions of the Board, the Chairman and the agencies under the Board. The Chairman's authority with respect to personnel was returned to the whole Federal Home Loan Bank Board by the Housing Amendments of 1955. The reorganization plan herewith transmitted would restore that authority of the Chairman and further increase his management functions.

Specifically, the reorganization plan will transfer to the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the Board's functions with respect to the overall management, functioning and organization of the agency; the appointment, removal and direction of personnel; the distribution of business among, and communication of Board policies to, such personnel; and the enforcement of policies and the general improvement of staff support. There are also transferred to the Chairman functions relating to preparation, review, presentation and justification of budget estimates and other fund authorizations and those relating to the allocation, use and expenditure of funds available for administrative expenses.

Nothing in the plan impinges upon the ability of the members of the Board to act independently with respect to substantive matters that come before them for decision, or to participate in the shaping of Board policies. In carrying out his managerial functions, the Chairman will be governed by the policies of the Board and the determinations it is authorized to make. The Board will have the authority to approve the Chairman's appointments of the heads of major administrative units, and the other members of the Board will retain their present control over the personnel in their immediate offices.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will provide sound organizational arrangements and will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impractical to itemize at this time the reductions in expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 12, 1961.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7 OF 1961 RELATING TO MARITIME FUNCTIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for the reorganization of maritime functions.

The basic objective of the plan is to strengthen and revitalize the administration of our Federal programs concerned with the promotion and development of the United States merchant marine by concentrating responsibility in separate agencies for the performance of regulatory and promotional functions. The plan provides, therefore, for the creation of a separate Federal Maritime Commission, composed of five commissioners, which would be charged with the regulatory functions of the present Federal Maritime Board. There would be transferred from the Federal Maritime Board to the Secretary of Commerce the award of subsidies and related promotional functions. The Secretary of Commerce would retain the functions transferred to him by Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 which reorganized the United States Maritime Commission into a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. The plan retains the present Maritime Administration, provides for an Administrator as head thereof, retains a Deputy Maritime Administrator, and effects no change in the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. The Federal Maritime Board is abolished.

Existing organizational arrangements have not proved to be satisfactory. The development and maintenance of a sound maritime industry require that the Federal Government carry out its dual responsibilities for regulation and promotion with equal vigor and effectiveness. Intermingling of regulatory and promotional functions has tended in this instance to dilute responsibility and has led to serious inadequacies, particularly in the administration of regulatory functions. Recent findings by committees of the Congress disclose serious violations of maritime laws and point to the urgent need for a reorganization to vest in completely separate agencies responsibility for (1) regulatory functions and (2) promotional and operating functions.

The plan would provide the most appropriate organizational framework for each of the functions concerned. Regulation would be made the exclusive responsibility of a separate Commission organized along the general lines of other regulatory agencies. On the other hand, nonregulatory functions, including the determination and award of subsidies and other promotional and operating activities, would be concentrated in the head of the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is best qualified to coordinate these activities with other transportation and related economic programs.

The vesting of all subsidy functions in the Secretary of Commerce will make it possible for the Congress and the President to hold a single official responsible and accountable for the effective conduct of all aspects of this program, including the size and character of the fleet under the U.S. flag, the need for Government assistance and requirements for appropriations to support subsidy programs. Furthermore, the placing of these functions in the Secretary of Commerce will assure essential supervision and review of subsidy awards.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will result in a modest increase in expenditures. The improved organizational alinements provided by the plan will, however, make possible a more effective and expeditious administration of the statutory objectives to foster and promote a U.S. merchant marine capable of meeting the Nation's needs in peace and war. Failure to meet these objectives would be far more costly than the anticipated increase in expenditures under the plan.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I have also found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of new officers specified in sections 102 and 201 of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 12, 1961.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7446) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7446) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

William I. Cargo, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel D. Berger, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony B. Akers, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Erle Cocke, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Mable M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Thomas D. White (major general, Regular Air Force), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay (major general, Regular Air Force), to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in behalf of Curtis E. LeMay, general, U.S. Air Force, and nominee for Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The reputation of this distinguished airman for his knowledge of and effectiveness in building air power is known throughout the world. It has been well said that he is more respected in the Kremlin than, perhaps any other American. The reason, of course, is that the leaders in the Kremlin know that General LeMay well knows what they are up to, that he has exerted tireless leadership in building and maintaining the air power needed to win a hot war if they decide to engage us in one, and that he has the courage of conviction and firmness of will to recommend prompt and decisive action where this is needed. Indeed, should it ever again become necessary for Congress to declare another state of war, I can think of no single individual in the Armed Services on whom we can rely more for the leadership needed at such a time to enable us both to survive and to win.

Because of his reputation as an exponent of the doctrine of strategic bombardment, many persons do not realize that his capacity in this respect is entirely consistent with his devotion to the cause of world peace. I know of no one either within or without the military who is more desirous of, and dedicated to, the attainment of a just and lasting world peace. He believes, however, as do I, that such an objective cannot be achieved with respect to the Communist world through a policy of softness and weakness, but that it can be attained only through firmness and strength—not only of our military and economic power, but of our national character, as well. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD, in my remarks, the speech delivered by General LeMay to the Air Power Council at Fort Worth, Tex., on August 26, 1960.

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

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY

Mr. Korth, members of the Air Power Council, the Convair Management Club, guests, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for honoring me with an invitation to be here with you this evening. Texas hospitality, especially the Cowtown brand, is world famous and I always appreciate an opportunity to return to the Longhorn State. Although I was born and grew up in Ohio, it is a well known fact that if a person spends some time in Texas he can't help but absorb some of the spirit of the great Southwest. Back in the late twenties I took my flying training at Kelly Field. Since then I have felt right at home with Texans.

As I flew in today over this great metropolitan complex, I couldn't help but marvel at the incredible growth of this area. It seems only a few short years ago that the national—the world image—of Texas was that of a vast rangeland inhabited by that breed of men who now dominate the television screen—the cowboy.

Television and motion pictures still perpetuate that image, but Texans know differently. According to the latest census, of the top 50 cities in our great Nation, 5 of those cities are in Texas. With 50 States being considered, this doesn't indicate to me that Texas is one vast rangeland. On the contrary, Texas is dynamic, robust, and going places.

Texans have always played a prominent role in the history of the Air Force. Up until World War II most of our flyers were trained here in this State. Texas can rightfully be called the mother of the Air Force.

I could spend all evening just discussing the various installations and missions of Air Force units that are centered here in Texas. But let me focus attention on Fort Worth and its contribution to the Nation and then discuss with you a subject you understand, but which today too many Americans do not understand—that subject is aerospace power—its use as a counterforce and the problem of time.

Back in the late 1940's you people here in Fort Worth were keenly interested in the now famous B-36 case. As Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, I, too, had more than a casual interest. History has proven us right in our faith in the Convair B-36. Now honorable retired, the B-36 strategic bomber force is acknowledged as having kept the world at peace for a decade.

There were many indictments of strategic bombing made at that time, yet public opinion and national purpose were strong and united. The B-36s gave us the range to ignore ocean and land barriers and made possible our national policy of deterrence of aggression.

Today the Convair B-58 is taking its place in our force for peace and Fort Worth continues to be a key center of aerospace power. Appropriately, the first operational B-58 unit is the 43d Bombardment Wing at Carswell. Carswell will also train all B-58 crews for the Strategic Air Command. The Mach 2 Hustler is a great step forward, a supersonic bomber that embodies the latest technological advances in aviation. Like the B-36 it is designed and operated to first deter war, but if war does come to join with our other aerospace weapon systems to decisively defeat the enemy's military forces.

The B-58 is a potent weapon system, yet there are still strong and vocal factions who somehow in their zeal overlook the fact that today, as in the late forties, warfare is still warfare.

There is no doubt in my mind—nor should there be any in the Soviet leaders' mind—that this is true and that this Nation's deterrent force is a war-winning force.

The Communists have not changed their goal—world domination. We haven't changed our goal—world peace. Therefore, we must remain vigilant to be sure we have a valid counterforce.

Vigilance and teamwork are required to insure against costly mistakes in building, modernizing, and using our deterrent military forces.

Let's take a look at our situation today.

Our national defense policy is that of deterrence. To carry out this policy we have planned and organized our military capability. That purpose has not changed and in a democracy, a change in national purpose comes as an expression of the will of the people.

This is our national purpose today.

We maintain military forces capable of deterring Soviet aggression. Our forces are strong enough to prevent war—or win such a war if it is thrust upon us.

While our poised deterrent power prevents war, we work toward durable peace, toward peaceful solutions of the major problems that divide the world into two armed camps.

Few will quarrel with this national purpose. However, there is a wide range of opinion when it comes to the amount, the kind, and the proper blend of military forces to provide the all-important deterrence.

An example is the theory that we can somehow prevent a war from occurring with a level and composition of military strength below that needed to win should war occur.

Does this make sense? I think not. And I think it is important that the American people clearly understand why it does not.

Our history and our actions today in the world arena continually prove that we want a permanent peace. This basic objective of enduring peace has yet to be won and until it is a reality, we are pledged to deter aggression. Thus our policy remains that of deterrence.

Unfortunately the word "deterrence" has come to mean different things to different people and groups. For example, there is a tendency to refer to any military force as a deterrent force. However, forces and measures which might in someway help to deter the start of war not necessarily those that could win a war if the deterrent fails in its purpose. Such a military force is not a genuine deterrent force.

The basic factors of genuine deterrence have been and continue to be:

Military forces capable of victory under all circumstances in the event of conflict.

Public understanding of the capability of these forces—and determination that they will be used if necessary.

And third, the enemy's understanding of this capability and of our determination and willingness to use these forces.

The Soviets have stepped up their propaganda efforts to convince the world that they are really preventing aggression by building massive military deterrent forces. They use deterrence as another word for aggression.

But the all important key is not yet within the grasp of the Soviet leaders. They do not have forces capable of prevailing under all circumstances in the event of conflict. This they still need to complete their plot for world domination.

Unfortunately, there are people in this country who advocate reducing U.S. strategic forces to a small, somewhat mobile, retaliatory capability suitable only for destroying cities.

Due to the constant dollar squeeze on national defense this concept offers the inducement of reduced overall costs. The Soviets incidentally think this type of force is exactly what we should build.

But what happens if we shave our deterrent margin so thin?

First, we cannot win the war if deterrence fails because, once we have used up the force and without a capability to restrike, we will be open to equal or worse destruction by the enemy's undamaged military forces.

Second, such a force cannot deter limited war because the enemy will reason that we would use an inferior nuclear strike force only as a last resort and not to halt aggression that does not directly threaten our national survival.

Third, this concept of force utilization is outmoded because destruction of cities is no longer a dependable deterrent factor if he can destroy our cities in return. Such destruction would contribute little or nothing to the outcome of the war. It would be an act of blind revenge.

Plainly, an inadequate military force of this type cannot do the job. By accepting such a reduced force goal we would sacrifice our chances of winning should war come.

Our forces, therefore, must be sufficient, prepared, and able to destroy any aggressor's military power to the extent that he no longer has the will or ability to wage war.

This is the type of military force we must maintain—a counterforce, a force that can win—the kind of military force that is essential to true deterrence. Anything less involves unacceptable risks to our survival as a Nation and argues for a return to the discredited isolationism of the past.

Thinking Americans continue to insist on an adequate counterforce capability and reject any compromise with security.

To be an effective and dependable counterforce, our aerospace power must satisfy certain requirements.

Victory in the past and in the future will be won through offensive actions. Defensive actions can only avoid defeat, never gain victory. Therefore, our strategic aerospace forces must possess a restrike capability. We must be prepared to fight a war with what we have left if we are forced to absorb a surprise attack.

If our remaining forces are not capable of defeating the enemy's military forces; if we do not have counterforce capability, we are left only with a retaliatory countercity force. And the Soviets might hope to discourage us from using this capability since it could not win.

Our counterforce capability must be a carefully prepared, maintained, modernized, and controlled blend of strategic weapons. We must select the best systems devised, in the proper quantity, and attain simplicity of operations for assurance of victory.

And because of the danger of irrational attack, we must maintain and build weapon systems to satisfy the requirement for both quality and quantity.

There is sobering evidence that the Soviets intend to match our effort quantitywise. The race is now on for quality.

Having both fixed and mobile missile systems in our force adds to our overall capability. This confronts an enemy with diversified strategic power which will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to destroy. But the numbers of missiles in each type of delivery system must be carefully weighed.

Mobility must be measured against reliability, survivability, and the capability to restrike in minutes or hours, not days.

When restrike capability is sacrificed for mobility then it is a false security—and we are trading the security of our Nation for the security of a limited and indecisive force.

With hardened missile systems we get more defense for the dollar, a restrike capability, better reliability, more positive control, and increased survivability.

We are not placing all our reliance on the unmanned systems. With an unbalanced reliance on ballistic missiles an intolerable strategic position could be reached in which there is no flexibility in choice of response.

With manned aerospacecraft that travel at speeds of mach 2, such as the B-58 and mach 3 such as the B-70, as integral parts of our strategic force, a nation can react to a variety of situations in a variety of ways. Our forces can be launched on less than certain information and recalled if the situation changes. The man in control can use his judgment when faced with different situations. He can observe, think, discriminate, and make unrehearsed decisions.

Manned aerospace forces give a nation options ranging from ground alert to launch of the force subject to recall. Manned aerospacecraft can be effectively used as a show of force to positively point out determination to the aggressor and reassure allies.

As you can see, the situation is different if there is sole reliance on missiles. In tense times there is no visible evidence to a potential enemy that a threatened nation is preparing its missile force.

Thus an intolerable situation can be placed on a President faced with making the great decision. He would have a single button.

He has no force to exercise, no options, no graduations in his action. He has two choices—war or peace.

This could become our situation with a deterrent force relying primarily on a single weapon system.

This won't be our situation if we continue to build and maintain counterforces.

What we have ready now we began building 5 to 9 years ago. What we will have in the mid and late sixties is what we start building now.

Every day, every hour, every minute must be considered as a national resource and used to the very second.

Time is one item we can't buy in these days of rapid compression.

Like death and taxes, we can be sure of obsolescence of weapon systems. Past experience and a knowledge of the state of the art enables us to predict the date of obsolescence for any weapon system.

Just as we can predict the end of the useful life, we can also calculate the date it can be operational. Between these two dates is the service lifespan.

Any delay in putting a weapon system into operation does not equally delay the time it will be obsolescent. Any postponement not only shortens the service life of a weapon system, but it may put our Nation in peril.

Recently a number of labor-management differences throughout this country involved our missile and other national defense projects.

I don't believe most Americans realize what work stoppages and slowdowns can do to our defense effort. I am not entirely sure in my own mind that all echelons of industry and labor realize the full meaning.

Disputes involving critical defense projects must be solved quickly by labor and management because if they continue, it can well be a dividend to the Soviets in their efforts to overtake us.

This is a personal appeal for management and labor to reevaluate their problem solving methods.

Labor and management must always counsel their actions with the heavy responsibilities they bear in our national efforts to maintain peace and security.

Every American should be concerned with this problem.

Instead of merely looking at a labor-management controversy with the usual two basic questions—what is good for labor and what is good for management?—this question must be added: What will this do to our defense effort?

I am not here tonight to point the finger specifically at management or at labor. I just want to remind you of a fact—we have

fallen behind in our timetable in certain critical areas.

Management and labor have to solve their problems so that we in the Department of Defense can continue to solve our problem—maintaining peace.

Today we have a counterforce that is capable of deterring war—and capable of winning any war thrust upon us.

I am firmly convinced that our continued peace depends on maintaining war-fighting and war-winning forces—that is what we mean by adequate counterforces.

But I am concerned when factions begin to neglect or ignore the facts and principles of warfare.

This is why I urge all Americans to remain vigilant.

Since World War II our Nation has been the leader of the free world and our strength has deterred aggression. We cannot—nor do we even consider—avoiding the responsibility of insuring peace in the future.

All Americans must work together and with our friends throughout the free world on this great peace team—and they must be alert to prevent any weakening of our counterforce capability.

The job of vigilance is everyone's. So long as we have organizations such as are represented here tonight we will have an informed people who will listen, evaluate, make their wishes known and take action.

Through your interest and dedication we will continue to have counterforces to deter war—or if that fails—to prevail over any attacker.

All Americans—civilian and military—are dedicated to the task of preventing war. Through teamwork, confidence in each other, and the courage of our convictions we will continue to maintain a shield for peace.

Because we are honorable people, strong with our belief and faith in God, and treasuring the freedom and dignity of our fellow man, we work toward the peace that all people so earnestly desire.

We have recognized and met the challenge of aggression. Determined and steadfast in this pledge for peace, Americans have shouldered the responsibilities of leadership.

We shall not fail.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in his long record of faithful service to his country, General LeMay has developed a broad appreciation of the many ways in which our political and economic systems function, and particularly their impact on the strength of our Armed Forces. He recognizes that one of the greatest problems we have today is labor strife involving critical defense projects, and the need for good faith in the labor-management team in order to avoid the loss of time, which is so valuable in maintaining our lead over the Soviets. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, the speech given by General LeMay before the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, at Los Angeles, Calif., on June 30, 1960.

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

DOLLARS, TIME, AND PEOPLE

(Address by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, Los Angeles, Calif., June 30, 1960)

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, guests, ladies and gentlemen, it isn't often that I have the opportunity to speak to such an important segment of the scientific fraternity. I regard this invitation to be with you this evening as a very distinct honor and a challenge.

In a few weeks the eyes of the world will be focused on the new arena in Exposition Park. National political convention time is near and, as usual, there is that big question, Who will be on the ticket? Some are very confident, yet a candidate can never be sure that he has the nomination in the bag. You in the Institute and those of us in the Air Force daily face a somewhat similar question on national defense—we can never be sure we have victory in the bag. Therefore, we must keep on working and developing newer and better aerospace systems.

A return to this city of Angels always brings this fact to mind. As I flew over this vast Los Angeles basin on arriving, I once again marveled and was thankful for the vitality and tremendous energy of this area.

Southern California means different things to different people. To some it is Hollywood or Disneyland or sunshine and oranges, but to me it is one of the cradles of airpower and today, as in the past half century, is the arsenal of aerospace power.

I think it is interesting to note the similarity of growth and problems of this mushrooming area with the building of aerospace power. A great and continuous influx of people and industry into this metropolitan complex seems to overwhelm city planning. A good example is the determined efforts of your local government to keep pace with the need for freeways.

Where land is vacant one day, homes spring up the next and who knows, next year a new freeway may come along and claim that same land. This is how the compression of time and rapid advances in technology can overnight make something that has just been completed, or for that matter, something that isn't yet completed, as obsolete as a buggy whip.

This matter of obsolescence keeps us in the Air Force awake at night. Our insomnia-producing problems are your problems, too. When you lie awake at night wondering if tomorrow your product will become obsolete because of a technological breakthrough, just remember that you are not alone.

Because our very freedom depends on taking every possible action to minimize obsolescence, one of the answers is obviously making the maximum use of the dollars and time we have available. I want to emphasize time. Every day, every hour, every minute must be considered as a national resource and used to the very second.

First, however, I would like to speak about dollars.

During the meeting here you have had speakers capably discuss the technical problems of today and tomorrow and ventured a look into the uncertain future.

These meetings are of great value not only to yourselves, but also to the Department of Defense, since we are both predominantly concerned with national security and security for the free world.

We are, in essence, partners and dependent upon each other. We in the Air Force are firmly convinced that the great potential strength and continuance of our technological leadership depend on private enterprise.

Our reliance on industry has been a partnership marked by mutual effort and trust. We have had remarkable teamwork and cooperation from the aerospace industries. We are aware of each other's problems—we both understand and appreciate the great technological changes that are constantly remolding and reshaping not only our defense structure, but also our scientific endeavors.

Extracting the full value of the defense dollar becomes more important and more difficult each day. I can assure you that we are well aware of the upheavals caused by weapon technology that constantly keeps your industries in a state of turmoil. Since World War II we have seen unit costs increase to as high as 50 times what they were during that period. The price of security gets higher each day.

It hasn't been a smooth road for industry in the past and the future holds no promise of improved stability. The rapid changes in technology, which you gentlemen are bringing about, are the greatest enemy of stability, but likewise the greatest insurance of freedom that we have.

The pressure is constantly on us, as well as you, to develop national defense systems that will be more economical to build and maintain. A good case in point is the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile. Beside other advantages from a standpoint of economy alone, it has great attractiveness.

To some, when faced with the dilemna of rising costs, the shrinking dollar, and the growing threat, the answer appears as a mixture of conflicting prescriptions to maintain our deterrent to aggression. The Air Force position remains unchanged. We must maintain a powerful counterforce consisting of a mixture of weapons. These cost money. With just so much moneys allocated to us, we must continue to get the absolute maximum from each defense dollar.

I am sure you will agree with me that nothing is more important than national survival. Our Government, in providing insurance for peace, pays a fair price, with the intention of affording a fair profit, in return for a product that meets specifications and the agreed upon time schedule.

There are, however, a number of problem areas that decrease the value of our defense dollar. I would like to discuss just two of them in some detail—time and people.

Recently a number of labor-management differences throughout this country involved national defense projects.

I don't believe most Americans realize what work stoppage and slowdowns can do to our defense effort. I am not entirely sure in my own mind that all echelons of industry and labor realize the full meaning.

Today as we face the greatest threat in our Nation's history, it behooves all Americans to consider this problem. Instead of merely looking at a labor-management controversy with the usual two basic questions: What is good for labor? What is good for management?—we must also add the question: What will this do to our defense effort?

My intention tonight is to bring into focus the end result of labor-management conflict so we all are more aware that not only do industry and labor suffer, but the Nation suffers. And the free world may be endangered.

Labor-management conflict can adversely affect our defense effort by:

Postponing the time when weapon systems can be made operational, thus shortening the length of time they are effective before obsolescence overtakes them—giving us less value for the defense dollar—weakening our deterrent force.

We have legislation designed to minimize and settle these controversies; however, no amount of legislation can force amicable relations unless there is the will and spirit.

The national labor relations acts require that collective bargaining be conducted in "good faith." Definitions of "good faith," however, are many and varied. The definitions seem to vary from firm to firm, industry to industry, from labor local to labor local, from labor union to labor union.

It has been estimated that there are about 100,000 collective bargaining agreements in effect in this country. Each day about 250 contracts are reopened for negotiations. These figures have a tendency to be overwhelming. Obviously, most of these negotiations are handled in a routine fashion by management and labor, which speaks well for both sides.

Many important negotiations, however, are not handled so quietly, and the general

public is denied the prompt settlement which it has every right to expect.

In normal times, the immediate impact of labor-management conflict is upon the stockholders and union members. But times like these, when the international atmosphere remains charged with unpredictable lightning, labor strife affecting national defense projects could seriously impair the ability of our Armed Forces to provide fully for the defense of our country.

Labor and management must always counsel their actions with the heavy responsibility they bear in our national efforts to maintain peace and security.

Ladies and gentlemen, there must always be a constant reassessment of national purpose. I am not contending that industry has grown fat on profits, that labor has grown fat on high wages, but I am warning that continued labor strife can become a more and more serious problem in maintaining national defense.

Labor and management must always temper their disputes with the realization that there is a third party in the field of profits. Industry has a right to a fair profit for its capital investment; labor has a right to a fair wage for its manpower investment, and the Nation has a right to a fair return on its dollar investment in defense.

The Air Force has followed what we term the "principle of concurrency." This principle recognizes that swift changes of technology limit the time that a weapon will be effective. Therefore, when we build a weapon system as the weapons come off the assembly line we must have operational sites ready to accept—and use them if necessary.

One without the other is useless. The two are a team. If it is vital in order to deter aggression that we have a weapon for a certain time period, then it is imperative that we have it in operation at the earliest possible time so that the American people are assured of continued world peace.

Like death and taxes, we can be sure of obsolescence of weapon systems. Past experience and a knowledge of the state of the art allows us to pretty well predict the date of obsolescence for any weapon we have in service now, building, or yet on the drawing board.

Just as we can predict the end of the useful life of a weapon, we are also able to calculate the date we can have it in operation. Between these two dates is the service life span. The longer it is, the more defense we get for the dollar.

While this is a fairly firm time span, in today's atmosphere of sudden scientific breakthrough it is affected by many variables, yet invariably the date of obsolescence remains fairly firm. Therefore it is necessary that once we determine the need for a weapon, that we get it into the inventory as soon as possible.

Any delay in putting the system into operation does not equally delay the time that the system will be obsolescent. On the contrary, any postponement shortens the service life of a weapon system. With regard to this problem, while there are variables, two things rarely vary—the date we need that particular weapon ready for action—and when it will become obsolescent.

Labor strife involving critical defense projects must therefore be solved quickly by labor and management. Time is rarely available to resort to the usual alternatives. The term "good faith" then must become a more meaningful phrase—a pledge.

Our defense team can only hope to obtain the full value from its investment when all of us are pulling together.

We cannot afford any complications or situations that slow down our defense efforts and shorten the service life of our weapon systems. If they continue, it can well be a dividend to the Soviets in their efforts to overtake us.

This is a personal appeal for industry and labor to reevaluate their problem solving methods. Time is one thing we can't replace, can't stockpile; therefore normal procedures for settling disputes are sometimes inadequate.

We'll get the defense the American people are paying for—and when we need it—by earlier solutions to these types of problems.

Another way to increase the value of our defense dollar involves people.

The Air Force has a wage problem. We can't solve it by collective bargaining. While labor has the right to strike, management has the right to lock out, we in the services have neither. We wouldn't strike or lock out even if we had those rights, but we have the right and responsibility to advise you, the public, of our problems and ask your aid in solving it. The problem I speak of is retention of people.

Since World War II, the services have worked hard to build a professional force. Not only have we in the Department of Defense focused our efforts in that direction, but so have many thinking Americans.

With today's rapid compression of time and space, it requires redoubled efforts to make sure we retain the best possible people to operate the best possible weapons. Decisions now must be made within seconds, action taken within minutes and the verdict may come in hours.

Only with a professional force can we hope to insure peace. I frankly wasn't completely satisfied with the pay increase given the Armed Forces in 1958. Mr. Ralph Cordiner and his committee did an outstanding job in reporting the situation to the Nation, but not all the proposals were enacted.

Yes, the increase helped our situation some. Our enlistment rates have been improved, but our rate of turnover is still too large.

A good example of this turnover is the situation we face with regard to our younger officers. Our aim is to have all of our officers possess a college degree. One of our sources of college educated men is from the ROTC program, but surveys show we retain only one out of eight of the nonrated young men who come into the Air Force. After their obligated tour, they return to civilian life where the opportunity for monetary gains are greater.

The last pay bill helped stem the tide but, ladies and gentleman, today when we critically need our professional force, scientific and technically trained people are still leaving us in numbers that I consider uneconomical.

As we increase dispersal of our manned bombers, and ballistic missiles enter our force in greater numbers, it means that more and more of our people are uprooted and obliged to seek living accommodations in areas where living costs exceed their allowances.

Together with a pay increase we need more attention paid to housing, especially in remote areas, and the quarters allowance must be revised upward to be realistic with present day rental costs. Rent continues to climb, yet this part of our pay structure hasn't kept pace.

To have a force in being, we must have the professional people on guard today and tomorrow. It's a fact of life that to have the best people we must be able to compete in the national labor market.

Just as we don't get full dollar value with labor strife, we also do not get the full measure of our defense dollar so long as we continue to lose young officers with scientific and engineering training.

A pay increase will allow us to compete for their services.

In closing, let me briefly summarize:

From the temper and times we must expect tense periods for many years; therefore, we must retain our posture of strength. Dollar and time savings are all the more critical.

Every defense dollar must be used to its fullest value. With unit costs rising at a fantastic rate, a smaller dollar and a continuing requirement, profits must be fair for labor, industry, and national defense.

Labor and management must increase their efforts to find means of preventing costly strife that loses precious time and dollars, which as a result can weaken our strength.

The services need pay adjustments so as to be able to compete in the national labor market. This action will not only enable us to retain our professional force for survival, but will in the long run amount to a substantial saving in defense dollars, which we need to purchase more hardware.

Positive action on these problems will do much to insure that we retain a powerful deterrent counterforce which will keep world peace until sanity settles behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MILLER. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the deep and abiding faith General LeMay has in the high principles of character to which we, as Americans, subscribe. He recognizes how important it is to instill these principles in the minds of our young people. I ask unanimous consent that an extract of General LeMay's speech on May 7, 1960, before the St. Louis, Mo., area council of the Boy Scouts of America be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY

When I learned I was to talk to an audience composed of Scout leaders and parents, I did the usual mental work involved in selecting a subject I felt was appropriate to the occasion.

Surprisingly enough, the solution was simple. I chose as a subject one that I find deeply absorbing—people—and I found a source of inspiration that most of you have in your homes, "The Handbook for Boys."

If you parents haven't read this book lately, let me recommend it to you. It doesn't take much time to read chapter 2. I found it both interesting and inspiring.

This book, written in simple, direct words, captures so much of democracy, it should be compulsory reading for our youth.

I don't intend to bring the adults down to the age level of their sons. Rather, I think we should look at it the other way around. Let us all get up on the higher level on which Scouts are patterning their lives.

If the people of the world would follow the rules of scouting, this would be a much better world. I sincerely feel that one significant hope for lasting peace is through such movements as scouting.

The children of today's world, the citizens of tomorrow, can lead mankind out of the wilderness.

The Scout oath or promise is eloquent and meaningful.

Most of us today are native-born citizens. We were not required to take an oath for the privilege of being an American.

In our schools, the children repeat the Oath of Allegiance. But once out of school, very few of us have occasion to say these simple, but important, words of confirmation that we are Americans.

I like to think all of us who are native were born with a silver spoon in our mouth. What greater wealth can a child be given than to be awarded citizenship in our Nation at birth?

I am particularly drawn to the word "honor." This is a priceless quality. Especially today when freemen with honor pursue earnestly the cause of peace with men who have proven time and again that honor has no meaning in their way of life.

Honor is not a matter of birth. Instilled in us by our parents and leaders it is the highest quality of character and treasured by freemen everywhere.

Since the founding of our Nation, many Americans have given the supreme sacrifice because they were honorable men and believed so sincerely in what they stood for that retaining honor was more important than loss of life.

The "Handbook" notes the importance of honor by reminding that the last two words of the Declaration of Independence are "sacred honor."

Honor is sacred to a freeman. As long as we have this spirit in Americans, we have no fear. We shall be strong.

Another word that is significant in the oath is "duty"—"duty to God and my country."

Duty is not an easy virtue. A person is not born with a sense of responsibility, but acquires it through learning and in the development of character. Through the home, church, and such programs as scouting, our young people come to learn the meaning of duty to God and country. Strength of character and the value a man or woman, boy or girl, places on his or her personal integrity are the basic ingredients of duty.

Duty is not something that can be learned from a book, but must be learned through a series of events in the life of a young person. Invariably, a young man who has had the benefit of scouting comes of age with a much greater awareness of sense of duty and has the foundation for leadership.

Equally impressive are the Scout laws. I would like to draw special attention to only four of them which I believe have a great bearing on the ability of this Nation to maintain peace.

The first is trustworthiness.

The very foundation of our Nation is built on the premise that we trust our fellow men.

Our Defense Establishment likewise is built upon the premise that when entrusted with a task, a man will do that task even if it calls for the gravest of hardships and even death.

Since we are a cooperative people, the success of our way of life depends upon trust. Unselfish trust, and belief in our form of government, have made us strong.

In the defense of our Nation we must entrust secrets, great sums of money, the operation of our defense forces—yes, even the very security of the Nation and our freedom—to mortal men.

Those men must, above all, have this quality of trustworthiness that is enshrined in the hearts of Boy Scouts.

To say that a man's word is his bond is a splendid tribute. The same is said for a nation.

The word of the United States is known the world over as a bond. We have earned that honor by virtue of being trustworthy. Our position today is a tribute to the trust that other people place in us. To retain that position we must have a continuation of this trust.

Loyalty—here is another attribute that makes for greatness, not only as individuals, but also as a nation. We are loyal to our friends and come to their aid when they are threatened. This national sense of loyalty comes from the collective loyalty of our people.

Both loyalty and trustworthiness begin in the home. So does the third law I want to discuss, obedience. I think that this is one of the hardest laws to obey, not only for our young people but also for our adults.

We are a nation of individualists. A majority of our people temper their individualism with obedience to the laws of the land.

Fortunately, only a small minority of our people abuse the privilege of individualism and the right to disagree. Some men seek to hide behind the mask of individualism when really they have never learned the lesson of obedience and the democracy of majority rule.

The best American is an obedient American—obedient to his God, his nation, his family and his friends. Without obedience we could not build a defense for this Nation.

Teach individualism, but also teach obedience. They must work as partners to make a good citizen.

The fourth law I have in mind is bravery.

A man is not born brave. Bravery comes from a mixture of elements in the character of a person. Men are brave in battle because they have conviction; they believe and cherish what they are fighting for.

Bravery is a state of mind, a result of training and preparation, not only in the military services, but in the home, the schools, and organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America.

All of these attributes—honor, duty, trustworthiness, loyalty, obedience, and bravery—characterize the American fighting man. I know of no better learning field than the Boy Scout program.

At this point let me make one thing clear—I don't believe that leaders are born, I believe that leaders are made. True, many of the qualities of leadership are a blessing of birth, but, like any inherent quality, development is the key.

Nor do I believe that leaders can be produced from any source of human raw material. If we could do this, we would have no problems in supplying our demand.

Leaders are a combination of inherent human qualities and training. We have as great a need today for leaders as at any time in our Nation's history. As parents and leaders, you have a great responsibility to your Nation.

We in the Air Force have a great responsibility, too. To discharge our responsibility it is necessary that we have the quality product that you produce—the young men that will lead our Nation in its task of preserving peace in the world.

In effect, we have a common task—the production and use of leaders.

No greater source of leaders can be found than from the scouting movement. As an American, I deeply appreciate the unselfish work you people are doing and I'm grateful that you continue to give our Nation the reservoir of leaders that we must have to retain our role as the keeper of peace.

There is a common tendency today to give great publicity to delinquent youth. Not only publicity, but great sums of public money are expended for their rehabilitation.

We as a nation are sincerely worried over the bad apples and often lose sight of the vast majority of the crop—the fine young men and women we produce.

Today there is a great hue and cry for various youth programs, but they seem to concentrate on the delinquent. I don't pretend to know the answer, but I would like to see some attention given toward a national effort to produce more and better young leaders.

We have the raw product, but we aren't organized. Scouting is one movement that is organized for the production of leaders.

We in the services benefit from your efforts, but there is much leadership potential that goes wasted. Scouting is one movement that can lead the way in this quest for a trained leadership. Striking proof of this is the tremendous growth of the Explorer movement. Yet I am told that only 6 percent of our Nation's 5½ million teenagers are in the movement.

I am told that there are approximately 40,000 Boy Scouts in this area. I am not too concerned about that 40,000, but I am concerned about the many thousands other boys who don't have the opportunity to become Scouts.

You people have done a magnificent job, but your job has only begun. Tonight it is fitting that you are honored with this appreciation dinner. Hard work deserves a moment where the past accomplishments can be reviewed.

But also I think it is appropriate at this time that you reassess your past accomplishments and look to the future. Your Nation needs even greater efforts. The real vitality of any defense force is the individual.

In modern times, decisions for survival must be made in seconds, the reaction in minutes, and the final decision in war may well come in hours. Only by having the best possible people in a professional corps can we expect to have such a force.

These professionals need the qualities of scouting—the leadership they have been taught, the patriotism and devotion to duty that comes only from the home, school, and church.

We don't ask you to train your boy to be a soldier, sailor, or airman—train him to be an American with the principles of scouting. That will do the job and we will continue to have peace.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in conclusion, Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will see fit to confirm this nomination. It is one of the most important nominations we shall act upon, and confirmation will be an appropriate expression of the confidence of the American people in the superb qualities of General LeMay and due recognition of the service he has given his country and will now even better be able to give in the future.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

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

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

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY AND IN THE AIR FORCE, PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Air Force, received by the Senate on May 23 and May 22, 1961, respectively, and placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

The Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Youth Conservation Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING IN NEW YORK

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to hold hearings in New York June 15 and 16, 1961.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1962, FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $84,640 for the legislative branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROJECT PROPOSAL UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on a project proposal by the State of Hawaii under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 136

"Whereas fast and adequate written communication is a basic requisite for maintaining the standard of excellence and progress of our 20th century civilization; and

"Whereas present facilities and supplies for written communication are overtaxed by the demands put upon them; a burden greatly increased by the traditional form of spelling in English-speaking countries because that form requires the use of many superfluous letters in spelling most words in daily use; and

"Whereas reformed and simplified spelling will be helpful to all people of our country now, as well as future generations, and would result in a great saving of time and supplies in all forms of written communication, and especially in newspaper and periodical publications; and

"Whereas it is necessary to establish an acceptable standard for reformed and simplified spelling, and that such a standard could be furnished by an official U.S. dictionary with reformed and simplified spelling, compiled and published by an official agency of the National Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the President of the United States and the National Congress are requested and urged to initiate and support legislation to establish a National Spelling Commission, charged with the duty and authority to compile, edit, write and establish the U.S. Official Dictionary with reformed and simplified spelling as well as pronunciation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Senators representing California, and to each member of the California delegation in the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 130

"Whereas the settled policy of the Congress of the United States in the field of water resources activities and basin planning is stated repeatedly in the symposium of 31 reports of the Select Committee on Natural Water Resources of the U.S. Senate, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 48, 86th Congress; and

"Whereas in committee print No. 15 of said report it is specifically stated that—

"'The obvious way to achieve such coordination is to require that all developments within a basin shall fit as nearly as possible into and constitute an integral part of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the basins resources. This concept is now well established and the Congress has taken a number of steps to implement it. One important step in this direction is the efforts the Congress has, in a number of instances, authorized the Federal agencies to develop overall plans for important regions. At the present time comprehensive plans have been completed or are being completed under the leadership of the Corps of Engineers, and in full cooperation with States and other Federal agencies, in the Delaware and Columbia River Basins, and are being developed for river basins in the Southeast, and for the Texas basins, by "study commissions" established by Congress for the purpose. Such developments indicate that the Congress is willing to do its part to implement the concept of comprehensive and coordinated development plans'; and

"Whereas the State of California has benefited greatly in past years from the coordinated activities of Federal agencies in the construction of projects to control floods, conserve water, and to provide other water-associated benefits as carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army; and

"Whereas the State of California looks forward to continued activity by these two agencies toward the fuller development of the State's water resources; and

"Whereas major projects such as the San Luis unit have been authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and other major units such as Auburn Dam, Folsom south unit, and the east side division of the Central Valley project are approaching the authorization stage; and

"Whereas virtually no multiple purpose projects remain to be constructed in California which have been authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas a number of proposed flood control and water development projects do remain in California which may be susceptible of development by the Corps of Engineers on the upper Sacramento River, Cache Creek, the Fresno River, Chowchilla River, Eel River, and other north coast streams, Consumnes River, and streams in the San Francisco Bay area; and

"Whereas the Congress throughout the decades has assigned to the Corps of Engineers the tasks of planning and developing systems of public works, for the control of floods in the rivers of the Nation; for the improvement of navigation in rivers, canals, and harbors of the Nation; for the protection of river banks and coastal shores, for the planning of highways and systems of transportation needed for the military defense of the Nation, and the making of coordinated basin plans for public works: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Senate of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and provide funds to authorize the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources, and in conjunction with a study commission and other Federal and State agencies, to make studies which would lead to multipurpose development of these basins; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Chief of Engineers.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to refrain from passing S. 1643 or H.R. 6400, commonly known as the omnibus farm bill; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, opposing and disapproving the payment of any ransom or tribute to any foreign power and particularly and specifically opposes and disapproves the unofficially sanctioned campaign to ca-

pitulate to Castro's plot of extortion; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, to oppose Federal aid to public schools and to provide that should the U.S. Congress enact legislation providing Federal aid to public schools that it allot 1 percent of the Federal income tax collections for this purpose to the States to be used without Federal control or intervention in areas where collected; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE ON HARLINGEN AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution by the Texas House of Representatives urging that the Secretary of the Air Force reconsider the order to close Harlingen Air Force Base.

This resolution also asks that after reconsideration of this matter, if the Secretary of the Air Force deems closure of the base absolutely necessary to the most efficient operation of overall defense activities, then the General Services Administration find a suitable means of utilizing this valuable and well-located facility.

Mr. President, while I am personally urging the Air Force to keep Harlingen Air Force Base in operation, I want to add my own emphasis to the Texas Legislature's resolution calling for GSA studies for other uses of this fine facility.

All of us know that the Congress has been called upon, and rightly I believe, to approve many millions of dollars in additional expenditures for defense construction, public works projects, and for other purposes. I generally support these programs as sound and necessary. But I do believe that it is time that we raised this point in the interest of being absolutely sure that we get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent.

The GSA, the Department of Defense, and all other directly concerned agencies should now more than ever before take a very careful look at existing facilities before planning to build new buildings and other facilities. In spite of the fact that an existing airbase might not be located exactly where an agency would like to have it, or the buildings were not exactly laid out to suit planned operations, I strongly believe that existing facilities should be converted to meet new needs and utilized for many years to come.

Mr. President, I know that modern defense needs and other factors make it necessary for us to construct massive new facilities in new locations. But I think all of us should be especially careful at this time when approving expenditures for new construction to be sure that there is not an abandoned airbase or some other Government-owned installation that could be utilized at considerably less investment of tax dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the Texas Legislature's resolution on Harlingen Air Force Base be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the Harlingen Air Force Base at Harlingen, Tex., has been ordered to close by the U.S. Air Force; and

Whereas the closing of said airbase will present a problem and will force an economic lag in the area; and

Whereas the base is in excellent condition and the area surrounding it is blessed with the best weather in the United States for all-around use of the airbase; and

Whereas the housing and recreational facilities in the area are extremely favorable; and

Whereas the people of the area have always maintained very friendly and cordial relations with the military: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, That it recommend to the Secretary of the Air Force that he reconsider the order to close Harlingen Air Force Base; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas recommend to the Director of the General Services Administration that should Harlingen Air Force Base be closed, the base be utilized for some other suitable purpose.

RESOLUTION OF AMALGAMATED LAUNDRY WORKERS JOINT BOARD ACWA, AFL-CIO, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Amalgamated Laundry Workers Joint Board, ACWA, AFL-CIO, of New York City, relating to the freedom riders.

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

RESOLUTION ON THE FREEDOM RIDERS

Another battle in the great fight for the future is being fought in America's Deep South.

As in other battles in that area—those at the schools of New Orleans, Little Rock, and other communities, the lunch counter sit-ins and many more—the frontline fighters for our country's ideals are young people.

This time the battleground is in interstate buses and bus terminals.

The issue is the same as in all the other battles: The right of all Americans to move freely, to share in public facilities without discrimination, to assert their human rights and dignity without fear.

We call this a battle because those who are fighting on the side of decency are doing so at the risk of life and limb. But they come without weapons, with no intention of doing violence. They defend themselves only with their courage and their faith that right will prevail.

There can be little question but that in time the faith and courage of these young people and others like them will prove to be the strongest weapons of them all.

But in the meantime, they are exposed and others will be exposed to acts of violence by ugly mobs and by local and State officials whose sympathies are with the mobs.

And in the meantime, too, America's posture in the world will go on being undermined by such actions and the forces of communism will be proportionately strengthened: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Amalgamated Laundry Workers Joint Board, ACWA, AFL-CIO:

1. Compliments the Federal administration for dispatching Justice Department forces to Alabama to protect the freedom riders and for its efforts to persuade the State authorities to do their duty.

2. Urges the President and Attorney General to stand firm in protecting the rights of the freedom riders and of all those who will press against the barriers of discrimination and segregation in every area. No responsible official can ask them to give up their part of the struggle in order to keep peace; rather ask those who are breaking the peace in order to preserve the rights of bigotry and hatred to cease their efforts.

3. To the freedom riders, the schoolchildren, the lunch counter sit-ins and all the others, past, present and future, who serve in the frontlines of this great battle for the future—we express our grateful appreciation. For they are fighting on behalf of all Americans who believe in freedom and decency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 2972. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales (Rept. No. 363).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1750. A bill to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota (Rept. No. 366).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 4500. An act to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais approximately thirty-six one-hundredths acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla. (Rept. No. 368).

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. 367)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance. I submit a report on title II of the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

TIME FOR FILING REPORT ON RENEGOTIATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437) relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on

Internal Revenue Taxation, and I submit a report (No. 362) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said:

Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437), which was reported to the Senate earlier today by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], from the Committee on Finance, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437) relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this resolution was before the Finance Committee and was unanimously reported favorably to the Senate. I hope the Senate will approve it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (H.J.Res. 437) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ENTITLED "A BUILDING FOR A MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY" (S. REPT. NO. 365)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 106 of the 84th Congress, I submit to the Senate a report from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution. I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

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. KEFAUVER:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Horst Karl-Heinz Betz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2053. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2054. A bill to promote the foreign relations of the United States by providing for the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2055. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take the necessary action to confirm to the State of Idaho full and clear title to certain lands previously selected by such State in lieu of public school land grants made by the Idaho Admission Act for the financing of endowments of Idaho public schools; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2056. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2057. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1960, Public Law 86-559, with respect to commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2058. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the counterfeiting of State obligations in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2059. A bill to enable the Secretary of State to make such changes in the higher ranking personnel of the Department of State as he deems advisable; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Saleema Kouri Hamra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2061. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; and

S. 2062. A bill to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr COOPER (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2063. A bill to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Yu Sui Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination of candidates for President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings of the National Water Research Symposium, sponsored by the National Reclamation Association and the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, on March 28 through 30, 1961, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL STAMP COMMEMORATING 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on December 7 of this year, Americans will be observing the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. This occasion will bring to mind our entry into the war in the Pacific and an attack on American soil in World War II.

On December 7, 1941, 3,067 Americans were killed in the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, and citizens of every State are listed on the rolls of those who lost their lives that tragic Sunday morning.

Under the auspices of the Pacific War Memorial Commission, a memorial is at last being built over the U.S.S. *Arizona*, which was sunk in the attack; 1,102 Americans are still entombed in the *Arizona*. A bill now before this body would authorize the appropriation of funds necessary to complete the memorial.

Elaborate plans are now being made for the dedication of this memorial on the 20th anniversary of the attack. It is hoped that the necessary legislation can be passed in this session so that we can be assured of funds to complete it.

In addition to the dedication of the *Arizona* Memorial, I propose that a special commemorative stamp be issued by the Postmaster General so that the whole Nation may observe the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

I therefore introduce a bill providing for a commemorative stamp in tribute to those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor.

My bill proposes that the first issue of the stamp be made on December 7, 1961, at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. In this way, Americans throughout this great Nation will recall the lesson learned on the morning of December 7, 1941.

It took that tragic day to awaken this Nation to the reality of a world in which peace and freedom cannot be taken for granted. Profound changes have occurred throughout the world in the intervening 20 years, but the lesson learned at Pearl Harbor is more important today than ever before. In a world of missiles and atomic weapons, we must be eternally vigilant.

I can think of no better reminder than the day on which armed aggression was committed against the United States by a foreign power. This reminder should take the form of a commemorative stamp of the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2053) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941. The stamp shall be first offered for sale to the public at Honolulu, Hawaii, on December 7, 1961.

PROPOSED NATIONAL FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the foreign relations of the United States by providing for the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2054) to promote the foreign relations of the United States by providing for the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the difficulties which we are encountering all around the world stem from many sources. Many of these difficulties are brought about by powers and forces beyond our control, and nothing we could conceivably do would cure them or prevent their occurrence. On the other hand, many problems could be solved, or at least their impact mitigated, by actions on our part.

In the implementation of our foreign policy, and in carrying out foreign operations around the world, we need today, as never before, a truly professional foreign service. This applies not only to State Department personnel so classified, but to those in other departments and agencies of our Government who regularly perform duties in the foreign field.

Today we do not have a truly professional foreign service. We did not need "The Ugly American" to tell us this, although this widely read and publicized book did bring home to many, perhaps in an exaggerated way, the need for improvement in our foreign service personnel.

What we have long needed, and what we still need, is a way to approach this problem seriously and on a long-term basis. Much needs to be done, and much is being done. I do not mean to depreciate our current efforts.

The bill I have introduced, however, will, it seems to me, furnish us a firm base on which to build a truly professional foreign service and to improve our foreign operations.

My bill provides for the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy which would serve as a center for the training and retraining of our personnel, and also serve as a center for scholarly research and development in areas of foreign activities.

This Academy would educate and train young men and women at the undergraduate level. The undergraduates would be limited in number, and would serve primarily to assist in setting the tone and standards of professionalization in the foreign service field in the agencies to which they may be assigned. It would not be expected that all of the graduates would go into the State Department. They are needed in Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, HEW, Treasury, and elsewhere. They would not replace, but rather supplement, graduates of our existing colleges and universities who now, and who may in the future, wish to play an active part in our foreign operations in the service of our Government.

The Academy would also train and retrain personnel already in Government service at the graduate level. Here again, this training would not replace whatever graduate level training programs may now be in operation; what we are now doing is not nearly enough. Rather, it would replace, expand, and regularize the rather inadequate operations now being carried on at the Foreign Service Institute.

It would also be hoped that this Academy would be the center of a great deal of research on foreign-policy problems.

Books have been written, hearings have been held, and conferences have been called to focus attention on oversea problems and to determine how our oversea employees can fulfill their vast and increasing responsibilities. The conclusion invariably has been that something must be done. But what has been done? So far as I can see, the little that has been accomplished has tended to be sporadic, unplanned, and insufficient. It is true that in-service training has been somewhat expanded and upgraded. Private universities have attempted to provide more adequate training for their interested students.

I would be the first to praise these efforts. But they have not produced a corps of professionals to fill the posts in our Foreign Service, ICA, USIA, and other agencies. We do not now have, nor will we have in the near future, adequate functional and geographical area specialists. We have even been caught without well-trained candidates to staff our projects and diplomatic posts in newly independent Africa, when the independence of these countries was scheduled well in advance. Even at this late date, we have been unable to meet the language requirements that today's foreign service demands.

Perhaps in days gone by it was realistic to think in terms of staffing oversea posts with nonprofessionals, and even today they can play a useful role. But this role will be constructive only insofar as a professional corps sets the general tone and a standard of excellence. For the burden of any professional activity must be borne by professionals.

I am certainly not suggesting that all of our oversea personnel should be trained in the Academy. We should continue to draw large numbers of recruits from our colleges and universities. But we can no longer afford to rely solely on independent sources.

I believe a Foreign Service Academy would furnish the mechanism by which we could face squarely the requirements of professionalism for the following reasons:

First. Through it, we could select some of our most able young men and women from all parts of the country.

Second. It could furnish a pool of trained personnel, and also provide for up-to-date information and intensive research on foreign affairs.

Third. It could serve as a center to determine the special personnel needs of our Government and could gear its curriculum accordingly.

Fourth. It could anticipate and set in motion programs to meet language and geographic area needs.

Fifth. It could be a center where experienced and responsible faculty members and Government officials, along with future policymakers, could consider critically long-range solutions to international problems and implement the policies by training personnel to carry them out.

Sixth. It could establish standards that would raise the quality of our entire foreign operation.

In short, this Academy could train professionals. I hope that the Foreign Relations Committee will set in motion a serious study and hearings to examine critically the bill that I have today introduced and other suggestions that seek a means of resolving the problems of improving our Foreign Service personnel. We can no longer afford to limp along with meager and uncoordinated reforms.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

SEC. 2. (a) There is established within the Department of State a National Foreign Service Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") which shall be under the direction of a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") consisting of the President of the Academy, the Secretary of State, the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the United States Information Agency, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and six educators not otherwise directly employed by the Federal Government.

(b) The President of the Academy and the educator members of the Board shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of nine years in the case of each such office, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for

the remainder of such term, and (2) of the educator members first appointed two shall hold office for a term of three years, two shall hold office for a term of six years, and two shall hold office for a term of nine years, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment. The President of the Academy shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum. The educator members of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate, not in excess of $100 per day, as is determined by the Secretary of State, for each day of service as a member of the Board, and shall also be entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while serving as such a member away from his place of residence.

(c) The President of the Academy shall be the Chairman of the Board. The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less often than once each quarter of the calendar year.

SEC. 3. The Board shall establish and operate the Academy for the purpose of providing a well rounded education for foreign service. Toward this end, the Board shall determine the numbers and fields of specialization of student candidates for the various degrees awarded. The Academy shall be operated on the undergraduate and graduate levels, and shall award bachelor, master, and doctor degrees. The scope of activities shall not be limited to academic studies only, but shall also include field work abroad.

SEC. 4. (a) The Academy shall be established at such location as the Board determines. It shall have facilities to accommodate a student body of three thousand.

(b) In addition to facilities at the site of the Academy the Board shall, with the consent of the agency concerned, be authorized to make use of the facilities of any agency of the Federal Government.

SEC. 5. (a) Undergraduate students at the Academy shall be selected on the basis of ability as determined in written or oral examinations, or both, and interviews held throughout the United States in accordance with regulations established by the Board.

(b) Graduate students shall be selected from among officers and employees of the United States in accordance with procedures established by the Board. Preference shall be given to those who are or will be regularly engaged in working with foreign nationals. Officers of the armed services may be eligible for selection.

(c) All students at the Academy shall receive subsistence without charge to them. In addition, such students shall receive compensation at such rate or rates as are determined by the Board.

SEC. 6. (a) Each student selected for admission to the Academy shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated, he will, upon being awarded a degree by the Academy, accept an appointment as an employee of the United States in any position for which he is qualified, for the three years immediately following the awarding of such degree.

(b) Each graduate of the Academy, unless already an employee of the United States, shall be available for appointment as an officer or employee of the United States, in accordance with the following priorities:

(1) the Department of State;

(2) the Department of Commerce;

(3) the Department of Agriculture;

(4) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(5) any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 7. The Board shall appoint such professors and others to the teaching staff as may be necessary for the purposes of the Academy. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at such salaries, not in excess of $20,000 per annum in any case, as are determined by the Board.

SEC. 8. The Board shall establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Academy shall have power to acquire and hold real and personal property and may receive and accept gifts, donations, and trusts.

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

PROPOSED DELETION FROM CERTIFICATE OR CLEAR LIST GIVEN TO THE STATE OF IDAHO BY THE UNITED STATES OF ALL REFERENCE TO PHOSPHATE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the State of Idaho was admitted to the Union on July 3, 1890. The Idaho admission bill, section 4 of the law of 1890, grants to the State certain specific lands from the surveyed unreserved public domain. Each surveyed section 16 and 36, in every township, was granted for the use and benefit of the public schools, while certain other quantity grants were made for the use and benefit of other State institutions. Where section 16 or 36, or any part thereof, was not available because of reservations prior to statehood, or before surveys were made, or where such sections had been acquired through mineral or land laws, the State was permitted to select lands in lieu from available unreserved surveyed public lands. This was through the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 796; 43 U.S.C. 851–852). The State wery wisely set up a permanent endowment fund to protect the revenues from the sale of these lands and the resources.

Originally mineral lands were not available for lieu selections nor could mineral sections in place be granted. The law was amended on January 25, 1927—44th Statutes at Large, section 1026, as amended by title 43, United States Code, section 860—so the State could acquire sections in place when surveyed regardless of the mineral classification. Previous to this, in 1923 the Idaho Legislature had passed a law reserving all minerals to the State, and the revenue from those lands has enhanced the Idaho public school endowment fund.

Many of the sections 16 and 36 as projected were included in national forests and other reservations before they were surveyed, so lieu lands were selected, using these sections as base. Such lands were shown in approved selection lists 15, 16, and 21, filed by the State of Idaho and approved by the Department of the Interior on January 31, 1918, March 27, 1918, and December 27, 1919, respectively. The base lands were in a national forest and the selected lands were in the unreserved public domain in what is now Caribou and Bingham Counties. While the Federal Government kept all the minerals in the base lands, the Board of Idaho State Land Commissioners was required to waive the phosphate only in the selected lands before they would be approved. The lands are in the same general locality and are all about equal in value, including all the minerals.

The selection laws have been amended and the philosophy of the Congress more clearly defined since these lieu lands were acquired. Public Law 85–771 of August 27, 1958, as amended by Public Law 86–786 of September 14, 1960, permits States to select mineral lands in lieu of the base lands if the base lands were mineral in character. Public Law 85–508, enacted July 7, 1958, known as the Alaska Statehood Act, granted to the State of Alaska 102,550,000 acres of unreserved public domain with an additional 400,000 acres of lands adjacent to towns and communities, also an additional 400,000 acres from the established national forests. All the full mineral rights go with these lands to the State.

Under existing law, 37.5 percent of the returns from a leasable mineral, such as phosphate, on public land, goes to the State in which the mineral is located, and 52.5 percent of the rents, royalties, and bonuses, is transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation except in Alaska. The State does not necessarily use its share for school purposes. The Federal Treasury, therefore, only retains 10 percent of the total returns, so the transfer of the phosphates to Idaho would not be a loss to the Federal Government when the costs of management, operation, and leasing are taken into account.

Mr. President, it is impractical for the State to manage the leasing of its lands with a phosphate reservation in the Federal Government. Vanadium, which is owned by the State, is found in varying amounts along with the phosphate. Oil and gas leases on the same lands are made by the State, and some coal deposits as well as other minerals owned by the State have been found in this locality. In some instances the surface has been leased or sold. This makes a cumbersome, clumsy management pattern.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to delete from the certificate or clear list given to the State of Idaho by the United States all referense to phosphate.

If we in Idaho can fully develop and use the total resources of these lands granted to us, we can care for our educational system without Federal financial assistance or subsidies. I feel sure that Members of this body will give earnest consideration to the merits of this proposal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2055) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take the necessary action to confirm to the State of Idaho full and clear title to certain lands previously selected by such State in lieu of public school land grants made by the Idaho Admission Act for the financing of endowments for Idaho public schools, introduced by Mr. DWORSHAK, 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, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to amend the certificates attached to approved selection lists numbered 15, 16, and 21 of school indemnity lands filed by the State of Idaho and approved by the Department of Interior on January 31, 1918, March 27, 1918, and December 27, 1919, respectively, by deleting from each such certificate of approval all reference to a reservation in the United States of phosphate in the lands covered by the said certificate of approval so as to confirm to the State of Idaho full and clear title to the lands so listed; except that such title shall be subject to any valid existing rights in the said phosphate heretofore granted by, or under the authority of, the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, and JAVITS, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation thereof, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2063) to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "President's Advisory Council on Education Act of 1961".

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the developments in technology and science have made it clear that the security as well as the strength of the economy of the Nation depend upon the education of its citizens.

The Congress recognizes that education must keep pace with the needs of the future.

The Congress finds that public and private studies since World War II have established the urgent need for improving the quality of education in the United States. These studies have shown that greater emphasis should be placed on the quality and content of curricula, on higher standards of scholarship, and on the preparation and effective training of teachers.

The Congress reaffirms the principle that the States and local communities have the primary responsibility for public education. It is consistent with this principle to provide means for the States to draw upon the experience and abilities of a distinguished body of educators, and to provide for the exchange of information toward improving the quality of education in the United States.

Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JULY 26, 1954

SEC. 3. The Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education," approved July 26, 1954 (68 Stat. 533) is amended to read as follows:

"That, in order to—

"(1) provide an advisory body which will be available for consultation on means of improving the quality of education, and

"(2) secure for the President of the United States the advice of a group of distinguished educators and scientists on means of improving the quality of education in the United States, there is hereby established the President's Advisory Council on Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council').

"SEC. 2. The Council shall be composed of nine members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who are leaders in the fields of education and science. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. Each member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that—

"(1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and

"(2) the terms of members first taking office after the date of the enactment of the President's Advisory Council on Education Act of 1961 shall expire as follows: Three shall expire with the close of the second calendar year which begins after such date of enacement and three shall expire with the close of the third such calendar year, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment.

"SEC. 3. The Council shall—

"(1) For the purpose of assisting in efforts to improve the quality of education, be available for consultation with Governors, the chief officials of State educational agencies, and the heads of institutions of higher education, when requested by them, on

"(A) means of improving the quality and content of curricula, with emphasis on the sciences, languages, and the humanities;

"(B) means of raising the standards of scholarship expected of students;

"(C) means of improving the quality of teaching; and

"(D) other means of raising levels of educational achievement; and

"(2) transmit to the President and the Congress annually a report of its activities under the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Council shall meet at the call of the President or the Chairman, but not less often than three times each calendar year.

"(b) The Council may appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, consultants and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties under the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 5. Members of the Council appointed as such by the President shall receive no compensation for their services, but, while away from home or regular places of business while attending conferences or meetings of the Council, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The explanation presented by Mr. COOPER is as follows:

The bill is similar to S. 2727 of the 86th Congress, 1st session, sponsored by Senators COOPER, MCNAMARA, MORSE, KENNEDY, CASE of New Jersey, and JAVITS.

Its purpose is to stimulate local initiative to raise educational standards and improve the quality of education.

It would establish a President's Advisory Council on Education, composed of nine members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, who are leaders in the fields of education and science.

The Council would be available on request for consultation with Governors, chief State school officials, and heads of colleges and universities, on means to improve the quality of education.

The Council would have no other powers. Its duty would be to be available for consultation with Governors, chief State school officials, and heads of colleges and universities, when requested by them on (a) means of improving the quality and content of curricula, with emphasis on the sciences, languages, and humanities, (b) means of raising the standards of scholarship expected of students, (c) means of improving the quality of teaching, and (d) other means of raising levels of educational achievement.

Such a Council of outstanding educators and eminent scientists, appointed by the President, could assist the States and the heads of great universities to put to use the knowledge we already have from the many public and private studies already made since World War II. It would provide a center of knowledge and experience, upon which the States could draw whenever they chose to do so.

A similar recommendation was made by the Hovde task force on education in its report to the President of January 6, 1961.

The proposal amends the act of July 26, 1954, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education, but never implemented.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL PRIMARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would establish a national primary for the nomination of candidates for the Presidency. This resolution is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 177 which I introduced on March 28 last year in the 86th Congress. This year hearings are being held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and several proposals for reform of our electoral machinery will be considered. The subcommittee's chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee, has graciously invited me to appear in support of my proposal.

Today I would like to state as succinctly and briefly as possible what my amendment would do and why I plan to press hard for its adoption.

First. In the first place there are glaring deficiencies in the system we now follow for nominating presidential candidates. The basic weakness is that the rank and file of the parties' membership do not have a meaningful voice in the nominating process.

Although the national conventions are theoretically democratic institutions, in fact they are not representative of the rank and file of party members. In a majority of States delegates to the national conventions are chosen by State conventions or State party committees. These conventions and committees are often dominated or controlled by a handful of political leaders.

In 15 States there is some kind of presidential primary, but in most cases these are weak instruments for carrying out the desires of the broad party membership. In some of these States the

delegates are elected by conventions and the presidential poll is merely advisory. In other States delegates are elected by the people but are not pledged in advance to support any particular candidate. In a third group of States delegates are pledged but State law permits them to switch to other candidates at the convention on their own judgment of the candidate's chances.

Only in two or three States, including Wisconsin, are delegates really bound to support the candidates who won the primary vote. Even in these States there is no assurance that the names of all the leading contenders will be placed on the ballot. The result is a national convention which is guided chiefly by the motivations of a relatively small group of political leaders whose primary interest is in what is good for their party organizations—local, State, or National.

Second. There has been growing support for broader participation in the nominating process ever since the national primary was first officially proposed by President Wilson in 1913.

Public opinion polls over the past few years, particularly since the advent of national television coverage of the convention, have shown consistently that the great majority of the American electorate wants a more direct voice in choosing its presidential candidates. In 1956, 58 percent of a national public opinion sample favored a national primary. President Truman has said he would favor a national primary if it were properly set up. Bills for a national primary have been introduced in the past not only by myself but also by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Third. Here is how my proposal would work:

Under the provisions of this amendment candidates who wished to seek their party's presidential nomination would file a petition with the Secretary of State bearing the signatures of at least 1 percent of the votes cast in the previous presidential election, and representing States of large, medium and small populations.

On the first Tuesday after the first Monday in August of presidential election years, a primary election would be held throughout the country. As in the operation of the electoral college, each State would be entitled to as many votes as it has Senators and Representatives. Whoever received the most popular vote in a State would win all that State's electoral votes and any candidate who received a majority of these electoral votes in his party would be his party's candidate. If in any party no candidate received a majority there would be a runoff primary in September between the two candidates who had the most votes in the first ballot.

I would assume that the parties would continue to hold national conventions for the purpose of choosing vice presidential candidates and to write the party platforms.

Mr. President, no one has as much right to say who should be the elected officials of a democracy as the plain voter—all the voters. Certainly this should apply most strongly to the elective office that is the most powerful in the country and constitutes the greatest and heaviest responsibility and authority the American people can give to any man. It should apply particularly to the primary, which reduces the choices to two, and almost eliminates any real choice for the millions of Americans who are consistently devoted either to the Democratic or Republican Party. I believe, further, that, in spite of his shortcomings, the plain voter will usually give the better answer in casting his vote.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am introducing this proposal to create a national presidential primary. I ask that this proposed constitutional amendment be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination of candidates for President, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS J. MICHIE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 19, 1961, at 10 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thomas J. Michie, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Virginia, vice Roby C. Thompson, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PROGRAM TO CURB ORGANIZED CRIME AND RACKETEERING

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 2:30 p.m., on Monday, June 19, 1961, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the Attorney General's program to curb organized crime and racketeering. The related bills are S. 1653, S. 1654, S. 1655, S. 1656, S. 1657, S. 1658, and S. 1665.

Any person desiring to be heard, or to submit a statement of views pertinent to the subject matter under consideration, should, prior to June 19, 1961, contact the Committee on the Judiciary in order that necessary arrangements may be made.

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. WILEY:

Excerpts from address entitled "Freedom Commandos To Fight Nonmilitary Battle Against Communists," delivered by him over Radio Station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on June 11, 1961; and

Excerpts from address by him at 75th anniversary of Seeman Bros., Inc., in New York City, on June 7, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement made by him in support of appropriations needed for the water resources of West Virginia, delivered before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and

Statement by him given before Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 12, 1961, relating to national fuels and energy resources policy.

By Mr. BEALL:

Weekly newsletter issued by his office, dated June 12, 1961, containing returns from annual questionnaire.

LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU—ADDRESS TO THE BURLINGTON-LAKE CHAMPLAIN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recently, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development, returned to his home State of Vermont, to address the Burlington-Lake Champlain Chamber of Commerce.

This was an important address, describing the progress which has recently been made in research and development for the further security of our Nation. The address is also significant because of the importance General Trudeau attaches to the St. Lawrence Seaway, now an accomplished fact, and the proposed Champlain Cutoff, which one day will provide an efficient means of water transport between the great eastern ports of Montreal and New York City.

The State of Vermont is justly proud that General Trudeau is one of its sons. For 37 years now he has served his Nation with distinction and high honor in the U.S. Army; and the time is probably not far away when he will retire to his home in Middlebury, Vt.

However, I am glad to note that his retirement may not come just yet, for it has been rumored that the President of the United States may call General Trudeau to the White House, to serve as the President's White House Chief of Staff.

This would be a most appropriate final chapter in the illustrious service General Trudeau has performed for his country; and, as the senior Senator from the State of Vermont, I would be especially happy to learn that this appointment had become more than a newspaper report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recent Burlington speech by General Trudeau be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

DYNAMIC PROGRESS THROUGH R. & D.

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army)

Mr. Ridgley, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, in returning here to speak on the soil of my native State, I am again reminded of the tremendous potential that lies ahead for the State of Vermont—for its industries and for its people—in the industrial and human fields of endeavor that can naturally develop and flourish in this favored area.

I envision also the benefits that can, and someday will accrue, if you can forge a further link in improving the access of this inland State to the great waterways and population centers of the United States and Canada. I speak, of course, of the Lake Champlain Cutoff. The fulfillment of this project to link the head of the Great Lakes with a deep sea inland waterway to New York can bring to Vermont a future more promising than we here can envision. With a relatively static population for the last century, it is time for Vermont to move ahead.

Now that the epochal St. Lawrence Seaway has been built jointly by the United States and Canada—a model of what international cooperation can accomplish by truly friendly neighboring States, carrying in excess of 20 million tons of deep-draft shipping, both lake and ocean—it is time to take further steps to assure the logical extension of that waterway south into the heart of New England to the ocean—to the coastal ports of the United States.

I hardly need emphasize to you the tremendous importance this inland sea route would be to the economy and military security of the United States—in terms of a protected inland water route from the mining and pulp producing areas of Canada and the industrial and agricultural areas in the Midwest direct to the industrial East. The savings in distance—more than 1,300 miles—and in travel time, the deliverance from spring flood losses alone would make this project immensely financially beneficial to the eastern sections of Canada and the United States, and the fact that this great development would pay for itself—is one of the most significant factors recommending it. Canada is on the move despite momentary difficulties we both encounter.

Our own Senator AIKEN has done yeoman service in keeping this project active before the Joint United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group. He has also been instrumental in stimulating and continuing serious and important interest in the U.S. Congress. As recently as last April, the State Department instructed our Ambassador in Ottawa to make renewed inquiries of Canada regarding her views toward helping to get this project started. Great projects take time but the seeds are in the ground. You must nourish them.

Our Army Corps of Engineers has deepened the Hudson River for seagoing vessels from New York City to Albany. With the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the great interest in making this logical extension to that great route, I have renewed hope that the Lake Champlain Cutoff from the St. Lawrence to Albany will be ours one day in the future.

Tonight, I would like to share with you some views on our Army R. & D. program, emphasizing what it holds in store for our Nation.

The future, ladies and gentlemen, is going to be very much different from the past. Our world today is torn by three revolutionary forces—each thoroughly determined, thoroughly defined, moving athwart each other—and all demanding and dangerous in their implications.

The first—and foremost—is the insidious ideology of Sino-Soviet communism; the second is the social revolution of rising expectations in the underdeveloped areas of the world; and the third is the tremendous explosion in science and technology which dominates our life and time.

If communism were a dead issue today, the rising tide of ethnic nationalism, which burst forth from the agonizing struggles of World War II and since, would alone present us with one of the greatest challenges of all time. This tide is creating truly significant problems in areas of Africa, Asia, and South America. In these areas the people—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished, living in a wheelbarrow and A-frame economy—call, and call loudly, for an improved standard of living.

It is in these areas that the world population explosion is mainly concentrated. This high birth rate is causing the poor to get poorer. Already some billion and a quarter peoples living in underdeveloped areas have an average annual income—far less than the weekly income of most men in this room—an annual income of less than a hundred dollars. Their total personal property is worth less than the clothes on your back and this is all they can ever aspire to own if they succumb to communism.

This population explosion aggravated by the flames of nationalism has certain serious implications. Overcrowded areas produce political instability—a condition that has a high potential for local conflicts and a derivative possibility of extension into global war. Overcrowded areas are fertile grounds for Communist political and economic penetration—where for a variety of reasons, the Communists find it to their advantage "to strike while the iron is hot and and to keep it hot by striking."

Let's turn now to that other revolutionary phenomenon which is drastically reshaping our world, bringing to today's generation and our children more changes and challenges than were faced by our forebears in any past period of history—the explosion in science and technology.

In business and industry—in politics and the military—even in the most fundamental unit, the family—the daily round has become firmly geared to scientific advances and it is an ever-changing routine.

Of the several components of national strength, a critical one in this day and time is military—adequate Armed Forces—to deter war, or should deterrence fail, to wage war successfully. We must not forget that diplomatic dealing without powerful cards always is a dangerous game. The stakes are such that there is no room for bluff or indecision. The game is for national survival—the winner takes all, and the loser loses everything.

Meeting worldwide aggression with measured retaliation is one of the foremost problems facing America today. And, in this protracted conflict, creation of new weapons and continual modernization of equipment is of vital importance. The key to strong, capable military forces—capable of meeting today's triple defense challenge in paramilitary warfare—in conventional warfare—or in nuclear warfare—from zero to infinity across the spectrum of force—lies in wise direction of sound and properly funded military research and development programs. Here I refer not only to the most publicized part of these programs—the applied research and development part which focuses on producing superior weapons and equipment to meet military needs 5 to 10 years hence—I refer with equal emphasis to basic or long-range research which concentrates on enriching America's storehouse of knowledge to meet the challenge of future decades.

Today's investment in military research and development—considering all the Armed Forces—is measured in billions, and it accelerates with the driving pace of scientific discovery and the rapid advances in modern technology. Each day we are learning how to do something better—how to build better weapons and equipment—more potent and reliable than ever before.

Change follows so closely on the heels of change that some of our operational weapons are hardly off the production line before they are obsolescent. This has caused more misunderstanding and criticism of the Armed Forces than any other aspect of our peacetime programs. I can assure you that we minimize waste of time, effort, and money through the closest possible military-industry-science teamwork, but some degree of obsolescence is a constant in the preparedness equation.

Leadtime is another serious problem. It takes far too long from the conception of an idea until a piece of equipment is placed in the hands of the most self-reliant man in the world—the man who wears his country's uniform.

Our present weapon leadtime is too long; it is running 7 to 8 years. The Soviets do a comparable development job in 5 years. If we achieve a technological breakthrough today, it will be 1967 or later before our new weapons systems can be in production. Meanwhile, the Communists could steal the information 2 years after we have it and still beat us to the punch.

We must whip this problem and I believe we can whip it through more rapid and intensive exchanges of information between industry and the Army at every stage of development—by new procedures for expedited development such as overlapping and telescoping phases of the R. & D. cycle—by conducting user and engineering testing concurrently or on a combined basis, and by starting production engineering and tooling as early in the development cycle as possible. By such steps—which we are now taking—we expect to short circuit the Reds with a hard-hitting cycle of 4 years.

We must field new and improved weapons systems more rapidly if we are to retain a military strength and flexibility to support a viable and effective foreign policy.

Tonight, let's look at some of the scientific wonders of today—products of military research and development—which are but the indices of what we may expect in the promising future. I speak of them not only because of their military interest, but because our attitude as Americans toward science and technology is an increasingly important factor in the fight of freemen to withstand and overcome the growing incursions of Sino-Soviet communism.

The Army's efforts in basic research—to penetrate the ever-shifting boundaries of science—are extensive. We devote about $30 million per year to this pure research effort, out of a total of $200 million spent on research through more than 550 laboratories, universities, and industries and 80 Army and other Government installations. A small part of this research is conducted in Japan and in 14 countries in Europe.

The Army is particularly aware of the necessity for basic research and will continue to stress it to the limit of available funding. It is the key to future developments—to the realization of radically new concepts and designs just over the horizon.

One of our most important basic areas is materials research. We know that our engineering design prospects are intimately bound up with discovery of new materials with greatly enhanced properties—conducting, semiconducting, insulating, magnetic and structural—and also important—with improvement of existing materials. In materials research, we are working on a variety

of approaches—in plastics, ceramics, cryogenics, pyrogenics, and metallurgy.

It is important to point out that metallurgy is a field that has seen tremendous advances in the last 10 years and can be expected to surge beyond the boundaries of our imagination in the next few years. New metals with amazing characteristics are being created to exploit extremes of temperatures, pressures, and purities, which we are encountering or using in the space age.

For example, it is estimated that within the next 10 years we shall have beryllium alloys with the strength of steel, but one-fourth the weight. Shortly thereafter will come plastics and ceramics with the same strength-weight characteristics.

These and other materials research-sparked developments will redound to the benefit of our civilian industry and commerce as well as to military—reshaping our pattern of living in the decades that lie ahead. Missiles, vehicles, and electronic devices will all benefit from such advances.

Research efforts are also underway to bridge the gap between metallurgy and solid state physics. Rich dividends, here, will permit us to chainlink large molecules to act as electronic circuits, giving us measures of increased reliability and space accommodations in our guidance and other electronic systems almost too fantastic to imagine today.

How many of us in these days of wondrous advances remain impressed by the fact that electronic parts have been reduced in size by modular concepts so that now, instead of 7,000 parts per cubic foot, we can put 350,000 parts in the same space. Now, even this figure can be increased by a factor of 10 in certain fuze applications, and using solid circuit techniques—or molecular electronics—even this is only a beginning. Just around the corner of tomorrow I predict we shall see wrist watch radios the size of an after-dinner mint.

Other significant basic research in medicine, chemistry, or unusual power sources—such as the nuclear reactor, the fuel cell, the thermionic converter, or the magnetohydrodynamic process—which our Army is conducting, is too numerous for me to cover in the brief time for this talk. But what I have covered should indicate that basic research is an essential ingredient of potential military power as opposed to military power in being.

These advances illustrate, moreover, the kind of basic research effort which is necessary to feed the insatiable appetite of applied research and development, for without new knowledge—without new science—applied research and development is limited to product improvement. Product improvement, important as it is, will not put us out in front, where we belong, or keep us there.

Now, in the other part of our program—applied research and development—we are working on hardware to improve our capabilities in the classic fields of military endeavor—firepower, communications, and mobility—the three fields in which any military force must excel. We have made great strides in materiel development.

Ground combat power today is, in terms of firepower, truly formidable. In communications—the essential ingredient of command and control—we have leaped ahead. And, in the vital field of mobility, the Army is on the verge of equally significant advances.

Now, I have given you as much of an insight into the Army research and development program as the clock will allow. This and all our work, is being done diligently to insure the continued defense of our Nation. We view all our contributions to the defensive might of America with pride—and equally important—we know that many of them will redound to the peaceful benefit of mankind and to our own industrial progress as well.

There should be no mistake about it, the Army spends its research and development money primarily to improve its ability to fight a war. Still, the dividing line between research for war and research for peace is not sharp; in fact, it is quite obscure. The Army has found that knowledge gained for war usually has wide peaceful application.

Atomic energy is an obvious example. Atomic and nuclear research for war, carried out through the Army's Manhattan project, not only produced the atomic bomb—but it also produced new life-saving radioisotopes for use in medicine. It also produced nuclear reactors to supply power for ships and industry and homes, and all the other benefits of an atomic age.

There are many examples, each tremendously significant.

Our Army Signal Corps pioneered radar in this country. Now, radar is found in scores of civilian roles—guiding airliners around storms and landing them in bad weather—giving improved navigational tools to ships at sea, and helping the weatherman make his forecasts, not to mention the aid it gives policemen in spotting speeders on the highways—a doubtful blessing to some of us at times.

Army research money ushered in the modern age of electronic computers. Early in World War II, the Army sought a better and faster way to prepare artillery firing tables. Out of this research came ENIAC—our country's first electronic brain. Now they are a national necessity in many fields of endeavor.

Our Chemical Corps, working out better means of laying down smokescreens on the battlefield, came up with techniques for using smoke clouds to deliver ultra-fine chemical treatment particles for fertilizing crops—and protecting men and crops from disease and disaster. The method involves new types of spraying devices and smoke generators which are now finding use on farms.

Discoveries and work by Army medical scientists have obvious and wide civilian application. Soldiers and civilians are pretty much the same medically and what aids one is bound to aid the other. The work of Army doctors on hookworm, dengue fever, malaria, and typhoid fever brought about better health for all mankind. Vaccines against viruses, preservation, and transplantation of eye corneas and blood vessels, new burn treatments, functional artificial limbs—all these are products, at least in part, of Army medical research. So is much of our advanced surgery as it was born of necessity on the battlefield.

The list can go on and on and by no means are examples limited to Army research and development. Air Force and Navy contributions through their military research and development programs are equally impressive. Today more than 300 new civilian products and processes have resulted from military research and development efforts—Army, Navy, and Air Force. Someone rightfully called these results double dividends from defense dollars.

Now, what I have sketched for you this evening should give you an indication that scientific research and technological applications bulk massively in shaping both our military posture and our national progress.

Each of us, here tonight, must perceive more clearly just how deadly is the danger that hangs over us.

What is needed in this country now—more than ever before—is an awakened sense of determination and vigilance on the part of all citizens. The President, himself, is my authority for this statement. It is being planted and cultivated and should be breaking through the soil of complacency as the warm days of another spring are upon us. We must break free from the fear and complacency that engulfs us and become again inspired with the moral strength, determination, and fortitude of our forefathers. We must replace fear with faith; complacency with courage; patronage with patriotism.

The great days of these 50 United States need not lie shrouded in past glories. We have but seen the dawn of our national achievement. Unlimited is our future if we have the courage to seek it. The days of the coming years burn bright with promise—for those who dare.

We mustn't forget our own history. The strong independent characteristics so noted in our forebears has in some strange manner descended to our time like the rocks and carpeted hills we love so much. I always like to chide Texans who brag about their early independence that they only maintained it for 9 years whereas Vermont was virtually an independent republic for 14 years. If we are to survive as a nation that kind of adherence to principle with a fear of God but not of Communists must become a trademark of every American citizen.

NEW FCC POLICY GETS SOUTH CAROLINA TEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the operation of one of the ideas of the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Newton Minow.

A few weeks ago, when he addressed the American Association of Broadcasters, his address covered many lines involving the principle of regulatory responsibility and licensee responsibility; and in his remarks he referred specifically to his intention, as Chairman, to look every once in a while at each of the renewal applications, since that was something of a public trust. Furthermore, he suggested that on occasion he would go into the local communities and would check on local judgments as to a local licensee's responsibility to the community. This led to a great deal of criticism of the new Chairman.

But in the meantime, one such examination has been undertaken, and local evidence has been collected. That was in Kingstree, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Louise Hughston, summarizing the experiences in that community, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 12, 1961]

NEW FCC POLICY GETS SOUTH CAROLINA TEST

(By Louise Hughston)

KINGSTREE, S.C.—It was "FCC go home" when the Federal Communications Commission opened an unprecedented hearing here last week.

But by the time the record was closed, the Nebraska-born examiner, Thomas H. Donahue, apparently had won acceptance of Commission Chairman Newton N. Minow's new policy of giving radio and television listeners and viewers a chance to talk back.

Minow alarmed the industry last month when he warned in a message to the National Association of Broadcasters that the triennial renewal of their licenses to operate their stations will no longer be a matter of form, and that he intends to find out what the people in the communities served by the stations think of the programing they are getting.

The Kingstree case was far from ideal for a test of Minow's new policy, but it has

demonstrated that with the proper approach and interpretation, the New Frontier can successfully set up an outpost in this untried area.

VULGARITY CHARGE

The Kingstree case originated months ago when the FCC received a complaint alleging that a disc jockey had been making vulgar and suggestive remarks on programs broadcast by Kingstree radio station WDKD. Tape recordings of some of the programs were sent to substantiate the complaint.

Louis Bryan, of the FCC Complaints and Compliance Division, checked out the complaint and recommended a hearing.

When the station's owner, E. G. Robinson, Jr., applied for renewal of his license, the Commission scheduled a hearing to determine whether the licensee had been properly supervising station operations and whether the statements he made in his application were true.

At the request of Robinson's attorneys, the issues were broadened to include consideration of the station's overall programing during the most recent 3-year license renewal period. The local citizens were therefore free to express their opinions on any aspect of their daily radio diet.

INTEREST HIGH

Local interest in the case was intense, for several reasons. The disc jockey involved had been with the station for many years and had such a substantial following that one merchant who advertised on the program testified his business fell off about 20 percent after the performer was fired.

Other local residents had been up in arms about the off-color remarks for some time; a clergyman testified that the local ministerial association discussed the matter but decided "there was nothing we could do about it" except appeal individually to Robinson.

Robinson also had many friends and business associates in the community, where he owned a 70-acre farm and a liquor store. Townfolks recalled how concerned they had been when his teenage daughter had a brain tumor several years ago and was critically ill for weeks. More recently, Robinson himself had been seriously injured in an automobile accident in which another man was killed.

Kingstree, population 3,874, is also the kind of town that is inclined to back up its native sons in conflicts with outsiders. It is so conscious of distinctions in nativity that its mayor, W. B. Bower, faced a campaign charge that he was an outsider; he had only lived there for 28 years.

Local attitudes toward Government agencies are doubtless influenced by the editorial stands of the daily newspapers that serve the community from Columbia, the State capital, and Charleston, both about 75 miles away.

Day after day, the newspapers deplore Federal taxes and the encroachment of the Federal Government.

The dailies gave little space to news of the hearing, and the local weekly, the County Record, mentioned it not at all, the editor explaining that nobody had asked her to print anything about it except the required legal notices.

WDKD also ignored the hearing in its newscasts, but television stations in Charleston and in Florence, which is 40 miles away, were permitted to bring cameras into the hearing room and gave spot news coverage.

Soon after FCC Broadcast Bureau attorneys P. W. Valicenti and Donald Rushford arrived to prepare their case, they heard a youngster pointing them out as "the guvament men." The day the hearing opened, a teenager at a party started the "FCC go home" cry.

When Examiner Donahue opened the hearing May 31 by calling for volunteers to testify, nobody stepped forward. Public discussion of community issues is not in the Kingstree tradition. Mrs. Robinson told a reporter: "If you have discussions in a town with this many Negroes (the county population is 66.5 percent Negro), you'll have one running for office."

PASTOR WARNED

Witnesses for the defense appeared voluntarily, but FCC witnesses came only under subpena. Some people could not be located for subpena—including the controversial disc jockey.

The pastor of the Kingstree Methodist Church testified that the town's two bank presidents, both members of the official board of his church, had warned him that if he testified for the FCC, he would hurt himself in the community and would hurt his church, which was about to start a building program.

Robinson conceded that in relation to the disc jockey he had made an error in judgment, and testified that he would never repeat the error.

In other testimony, it was brought out that his station had broadcast as many as 474 commercial spot announcements in one broadcast day, between 5 a.m. and 6:56 p.m. A former employee testified that he had been required to read solid spot announcements for 15 minutes on the air.

As the hearing progressed and it became clear that the FCC was interested in improving the radio station's service to the community if necessary, the townspeople and the witnesses began to relax.

Examiner Donahue maintained a good humor which delighted and disarmed the participants, and eased the strict rules of evidence sufficiently to permit witnesses for both sides to give pertinent testimony in their own ways, with a minimum of interruption.

The examiner found Kingstree a charming little town.

"I have always thought that it is advantageous for hearings to be held locally," Examiner Donahue told a reporter.

Kenneth Cox, Chief of the FCC's Broadcast Bureau, told the Washington Post that although the Kingstree case is not typical of the hearings planned under the Minow policy because of the vulgarity issue, it is a good example "that you can't really prove this kind of case without doing it this way and aside from anything the Commission may actually do in the case, it is good for broadcasters and the public to think about their responsibilities."

OPPOSITION TO INCREASE OF COMMERCIALS ON TELEVISION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in regard to a study of what America thinks of the increase of commercials on television. The article discloses that more and more persons are coming to oppose the increased amount of time being devoted to commercials at the present time.

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

MAJORITY OPPOSES TV COMMERCIAL RISE

NEW YORK., June 10.—A huge majority of Americans is opposed to plans to increase television commercials, this week's "What America Thinks" poll indicates.

Three out of every four persons interviewed said they were against increased time for commercials between programs. And of those opposed, about half volunteered the opinion that there are too many commercials already.

This is the question asked: "This fall, one network is increasing the time for commercials between programs by 30 percent. The other two networks indicate they will follow suit. As a viewer, what do you think of this move?"

PERCENTAGES SHOWN

Here is a percentage tabulation of the answers nationally:

Strongly opposed	24.8
Opposed	51.4
Total opposed	76.2
Industry needs money	3.8
Like commercials	1.4
Like more time between shows	1.0
Total favorable	6.3
All right, if fewer in number	5.4
All right, if better	2.9
All right, if better programs	1.9
Total qualifiedly favorable	10.6
Don't watch TV	5.8
No opinion	1.5
Total opinion	7.3

Here is a sampling of responses starting with those opposed.

"This can be the death knell for TV," said a Long Island real estate broker. "The constant interruptions for commercials have alleady discouraged and thoroughly irritated an increasing number of viewers. Additional interruptions will completely discourage interest in TV."

"This is ridiculous," said a Rhode Island salesman. "Many viewers are already turning off their sets when commercials come on."

"They should decrease commercials by 30 percent," said a Texas aircraft mechanic. "I can't concentrate on the shows for the commercials now."

"I make it a policy to stay away from TV-advertised merchandise just for spite," said the wife of a New York small businessman. "Nine out of ten commercials or obnoxious."

THOSE HELD FAVORABLE

Here is a sampling of those favorable to the plan:

"After all, the sponsors are paying for the programs and they have to survive," said a New Mexico wholesale official. "I am in business and have to do a lot of advertising, so I know."

"If the stations think they need more money, of course they should put on more commercials," said a Virginia railroad employee. "They are just like everybody else, trying to better themselves."

"Advertising is good, so let's have more commercials," said a retired Missourian.

Here are some of the qualified answers:

"It's fine with me if they make the commercials 30 percent better," said the wife of an Iowa salesman. "Some of the commercials are an insult to our intelligence and treat us as if we are so dumb and gullible that we will buy anything except Brand X."

"I know we have to have commercials, but I wish they would not have so much corn and would tell me how so many products in the same line can be best," said an Iowa landscaper.

"Some of the commercials are better than the picture and I look forward to seeing them," said a California painter.

DEMOCRATS GAIN SUPPORT ON PEACE AND PROSPERITY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent Gallup poll which disclosed findings of voter opinion on two questions, as follows:

Which political party do you think would be more likely to keep the United States out of world war III—the Republican Party or the Democratic Party?

Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or the Democratic—do you think will do the best job of keeping the country prosperous.

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

DEMOCRATS GAIN SUPPORT ON PEACE AND PROSPERITY

PRINCETON, N.J., June 10.—The closely fought 1960 presidential campaign saw the voters divided over the basic issues of peace and prosperity. Concern with the international situation worked to the Republicans' advantage. Domestic worries helped the Democratic cause.

Today—6 months after last November's Democratic victory—the two parties stand even in voters' minds on the issue of keeping the country out of war.

During the same period the Democrats have advanced to a commanding lead over the GOP on the issue of keeping the country prosperous.

To see how the public currently appraises the two parties' ability to handle the key issue of peace and prosperity, the Gallup poll assigned its interviewers to repeat two questions asked at periodic intervals during last year's campaign. The first question:

"Which political party do you think would be more likely to keep the United States out of world war III—the Republican Party or the Democratic Party?"

The latest survey—completed just before President Kennedy's meeting with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev in Vienna—shows the following division of opinion:

	[Percent]
Democratic	30
Republican	28
No difference	27
No opinion	15

By way of comparison, here was the vote on this question on the eve of the 1960 election:

	[Percent]
Republican	40
Democratic	25
No difference	21
No opinion	14

The second question asked in the survey: "Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or the Democratic—do you think will do the best job of keeping the country prosperous?"

The latest vote:

	[Percent]
Democratic	54
Republican	20
No difference	14
No opinion	12

In late October of 1960, opinion divided as follows on this question:

	[Percent]
Democratic	47
Republican	31
No difference	9
No opinion	13

THE OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had hoped that I would be able to support an expanded program for additional housing; but after following the debate, I feel I must vote against the pending bill.

At a time when we are faced with a budget deficit in the next fiscal year that may reach $5 billion, I do not believe we should vote an additional item of $9.3 billion for housing. This measure in my opinion is both extravagant and inflationary. I do not believe the evidence presented to the Senate Committeee on Banking and Currency or to the Senate has demonstrated a need for this type of legislation.

I oppose the new 40-year, no-downpayment, FHA-insured-loan program. While it is stated that this is a 2-year experimental program, those of us who are familiar with legislation realize that once we embark on a program of this type, it becomes permanent.

It is my opinion that this 40-year, no-downpayment, FHA-insured-loan program will, in the final analysis, do little in the way of assistance to those who are desirous of building their own homes. Presently, we have private- and public-supported programs that have demonstrated their usefulness in constructing millions of homes in our Nation.

There is much in this bill that I approve of, and there are many good features; but on the whole, I cannot support this greatly expanded omnibus housing bill.

BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation of freedom in West Berlin—toward which Mr. Khrushchev is making new threats—continues to be a must in Western policy.

Time after time, Khrushchev has threatened to sign a separate German peace treaty.

Until now, this has been used as a kind of threat to attempt to wring concessions from the West. An East German-Soviet treaty, of course, would mean nothing in terms of lessening Soviet control over the regime. The only real difference would be that Khrushchev could then say that troublemaking by the East Germans was out of his hands—even though this would be a lie.

The Kremlin, however, apparently is looking for an excuse to create trouble.

President Kennedy reported that the relative calm of his general discussions with Khrushchev was severely broken by a flareup on Berlin.

If this city—a showplace of dramatic differences between East and West progress—is, in Mr. Khrushchev's words, a "bone in his throat," then I say this is additional evidence of the need for preserving the interests of West Berlin.

Tactically, the outflow of such trumped-up accusations from the Kremlin is usually a forerunner of provocative acts by the Reds—committing the wrongs of which they accuse the West. Consequently, we—as we are witnessing—can expect new threats, or deliberate efforts to increase tensions in the cold war.

Berlin, however, represents a place where are drawn distinct lines of battle. The West has valid responsibilities and rights. The Communists can violate these rights only at the risk of war. The history of our own experience with dictators—particularly those of communism—demonstrates that one-sided concessions to them only pave the way for more concessions. If this is done now, it would seriously undermine the whole position of the West.

In Berlin, we cannot—we must not—back down.

We can expect, of course, that—as long as there are East-West differences and West Berlin is free—the city will continue to be a bone of contention, particularly troublesome to the Kremlin leader, and a focal point of periodic troublemaking by the Communists.

Today, the New York Times published an editorial, entitled, "The Issue Is Peace" reflecting perspective and clarification of the issues at stake in Berlin. I request unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ISSUE IS PEACE

Further evidence that Premier Khrushchev is not only nibbling at the periphery of the free world but also driving toward a showdown at its center, with Berlin as a focal point, is provided by a memorandum he handed to President Kennedy in Vienna and now propagandizes to the world.

In it the Soviet ruler sweeps aside all wartime agreements, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter and his own anticolonial doctrine of self-determination and undertakes to dictate his own peace terms to Europe. These terms spell out his grand design to use Berlin as a lever to conquer Germany and then to use Germany as a lever for the conquest of Europe that would assure a Communist world triumph.

Though maintaining previously known Soviet positions, the new Caesar offers the West three choices. With an eye on neutralist and pacifist sentiment that is always in favor of such projects he calls for an immediate peace conference to write a peace treaty with both East and West Germany, jointly or separately, and establish a free city of West Berlin stripped of protecting Western troops. This would legalize the partition of Germany, further Balkanize Europe and, as East Germany's Soviet agents boast, topple the ruling classes in West Germany and knock it out of the North Atlantic alliance, thereby wrecking both.

As an alternative, the Soviet ruler would have the Western powers join him in summoning the West German Government and his East German agents to a meeting of their own to agree within 6 months on both German reunification and a peace treaty. But the Communists insist that reunification could come only after West Germany has been socialized under a Communist dictatorship on the East German model. This would bring Soviet power to the Rhine and Europe would be at its mercy.

The third choice is for the West to acquiesce in a separate Soviet peace treaty with his East German agents. Under it Premier Khrushchev proposes to arrogate to himself the right to cancel Western rights in Berlin, to put its life lines under East German control and in case of a new Berlin blockade to back it with Soviet might even at the risk of war.

This is the somber situation to which President Kennedy referred. The West cannot afford to lose any time in girding itself for a showdown—militarily by strengthening its forces in Europe, politically and morally by broadcasting anew its own program for peace with justice and freedom. If that program fails in Europe, where else will people have any confidence in it?

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, TO GRADUATING CLASS OF BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the body of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered to the graduating class of Brigham Young University.

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

Members of the graduating class, faculty, parents, and friends of the university, it is with a sense of deep humility that I come here today in the role of commencement speaker. In the past several years, I have been privileged to speak on a great many campuses and with large numbers of American students. In fact, speaking with the young people of our Nation has become a cherished project with me. But it has not dulled in me the deep feeling of honor and responsibility which I always experience when I am asked to speak with students who have completed a course of studies and are preparing to move on toward new horizons and different endeavors.

This is a solemn and important time in your lives, and if I were conceited enough to believe that you look exclusively to me for the final bit of advice following your academic training the responsibility would be more than I should feel willing to face. But I have no such preconceived ideas. I know that you have received and will receive much sound advice to reinforce the training of the college classroom. And I shall be more than content if I might merely provide a bit of perspective to your thinking—perhaps drop a seed into your subconscience which might tomorrow or the next day or at sometime in the years ahead sprout into a thought that would serve you and your fellowmen well.

Like all commencement speakers, I am tempted to speak about your going out into the world, but somehow I am not happy with that expression. It seems to denote that you have spent the last 4 years in seclusion, or shut off in some kind of a cloister where the loud voices of events and people could not reach you. Now we all know that this is not the case—we know that going to college is being "out in the world" in a very real sense. If nothing else, it has given you a good taste of personal responsibility or you wouldn't be here in cap and gown today. And it certainly has given you a taste of competition and of receiving the fruits of your labor—in education and grades, if not in actual monetary reimbursement.

No, I'd rather think of this as a time of transition—as a time when you leave off one type of adult endeavor to go on to new fields, whether it be to higher levels of academic and scientific training, into a job or to spend a period of time in the Armed Forces. For many of you it will be a time of decision—a time when you decide what you want to do with your life and where best to start doing it.

I suggest that you have reached this pivotal time in your lives at one of the most interesting and challenging periods in the history of civilization. Ahead of you, along whatever route you elect to follow, lie vast opportunities—opportunities the like of which few people have ever left college to confront—opportunities which reach beyond the horizons and are confined only by the far reaches of space. Tremendous new fields have been opened up in science, in business, in government and in all other areas of human endeavor by "Plows of the mind" which have only turned over the topsoil. They need further development by intellects and hands fresh from the college classrooms and laboratories. They need working and perfecting by a new generation of scholars, technicians, and managers.

Even the great overriding crisis of our time—the continuance and extension of freedom—provides opportunity for the college graduates of today. I realize that it may seem overly optimistic to see opportunity for youth in a peril as great as that posed by the inexorable forces of international communism in their drive to dominate the world. But, I believe we must think optimistically and in terms of achieving the greatest job in the history of mankind and take pride in the knowledge that we undertake it in the name of freedom.

Now how does this crisis add up in any way to tangible opportunity for the young men and women who are leaving colleges and universities today to find a place where they can work and earn and contribute to the sum total of our free society? Well, to understand this, we must look at the problem. We must understand that a great many scientists and technicians and experts of all kinds are needed in the technological race with Mr. Khrushchev and his friend, Gagarin. And we must understand that continual and perhaps accelerated development and production of military weapons of all kinds and sizes are required if we are to remain strong enough to be truly freedom's champion in the present global struggle. This, too, will require a virtual army of scientists and technicians, but the important thing to remember is that this demand in the technical areas of endeavors—great as it is—is only a drop in the bucket to the demand that will be generated for workers in every category to back up that technical effort. Thousands upon thousands of administrators, supervisors, clerks and manual laborers will be needed by industry as we move to meet the growing challenge created by the threat of Communist domination.

And, in the nontechnical, nonmilitary fields of endeavor, the demand for competence and college training also will grow proportionately as the drive goes on to meet the needs and desires of an ever-expanding population.

Now, I believe, all this adds up to great—to tremendous—opportunity for the graduates of 1961. But I also am convinced that it will confer on you a higher level of responsibility than your predecessors were given. I think you should realize very early that if we are to win the final decision over the forces that would enslave the world, if we are going to preserve individual freedom and our way of life, a large part of the job will be on your shoulders. I am convinced that your generation has a destiny directly related to this Nation's chances of survival and the extension of freedom for mankind throughout the world. I believe you young men and women are freedom's greatest hope in what has come to be perhaps its darkest hour.

This responsibility of which I speak is a charge you should be proud to meet with your greatest energies and your finest thinking. It is indivisible from individual freedom and it is of one piece with the efforts of those quiet, heroic men who carved this great Republic out of the wilderness.

And, there is no way to escape it, for the events transpiring at this moment in the world and in the Nation are already engulfing you. For the future, they will have a great bearing on everything that concerns you—on your lives, your careers, your hopes and your dreams—just as your own thinking and acting will have a bearing on the generations that succeed you. It is indeed true that youth belongs to the future and the future belongs to youth. But, to insure the future, youth must think and act in the present. And it must look to the lessons of the past and learn what has worked and has failed if its thoughts and actions are to be equal to the challenge. Now you will note that I said look to the past and not live in the past or attempt to return to the past. This is a key point in the conflict of ideas which grip us today and a point upon which the future of civilization could conceivably turn.

Our responsibility to the present and to the future is to discover under what conditions man has performed at his efficient best. We must learn what philosophy and what system enabled men to make the greatest possible use of his God-given talents and human energy. We must pay close heed also to the philosophies and systems which have stifled the individual and reduced the industry, incentive, and improvisation which breed progress.

This is a process of learning that goes on forever. It does not cease with the completion of your studies here at the university, nor will it end with the completion of any future curricula upon which you may embark.

The entire human race, no less than the individual, must learn through experiences, for we have no method by which we can project our progress in the future unless we understand the principles and actions which contributed to the past. Without a clear comprehension of the direction from which we have come, we cannot possibly chart the direction in which we should go.

Now in considering the direction of the world over the recorded history of man's existence, we find a very curious phenomena—a phenomena which I believe must be thoroughly understood as we move into the crucial stages of the global struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery. And that phenomena is confined in space to the land mass of North America and in time to the 184 years the United States has been in existence.

This phenomena is one of abundance in the midst of want; of accomplishment in an era of stagnation; of hope in a world of despair. It is a story of the proper utilization of human energy, of the spiritual and material fruits of a way of life which has stood the test of time.

Yes, this is the American story which today is the hope of freedom. It contains the only elements of strength which—if they are guarded well—can meet the ultimate test of Communist totalitarianism. It is not a new story but it needs re-emphasis in the light of today's crucial events. We need to see it in the proper context, in the proper depth and against the backdrop of how it differed from what men had done before.

Perhaps the late author, Henry Grady Weaver, said it best in his book, "The Mainspring of Human Progress." At this important period in your lives I would ask you to consider his words carefully. Let me quote:

"For sixty known centuries, this planet that we call earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today, and among them have been men and women of great intelligence. But down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry and many of them have always starved.

"Hunger has always been normal. Even to this day, famines kill multitudes in China, India, Africa; and in the 1930's, thousands upon thousands starved to death in the richest farmlands in the Soviet Union.

"Down through the ages, countless millions, struggling unsuccessfully to keep bare life in wretched bodies, have died young in misery and squalor. Then suddenly, in one spot on this planet, people eat so abundantly that the pangs of hunger are forgotten."

Think of that. Suddenly in one spot of this planet a light appeared to shine bright in the recorded history of man's progress. Why was this? Why was it that after 6,000 years of want, famine was banished in America? Why was it that in the short space of 184 years, one particular group of people was able to do what had never been accomplished before? Why were these people, living on only one speck of the globe with only a small fraction of the world's

population, able to outproduce all others combined?

The answer lies in the thinking and acting of this Nation's earliest students, the men who drew up a form of government the like of which the world had never seen before. It lies in actions based on careful perusal of the lessons of history, lessons which proved that from time immemorial the concentration of power in the hands of the few had failed miserably to insure freedom or give people the fruits of their labor. It lies in a recognition of the fact that the failures of the past had squandered the most precious of all commodities—human energy—in suppressing the most precious of all rights—human liberty. They were to be avoided.

Therefore, the men who drew the governmental blueprint for America started with the assumption that men are endowed by God with certain rights and privileges and that government's only proper role should be in the protection of those rights. They rejected entirely the theory that man's rights stem from authority, from the state, and proceeded to build in our Constitution something new and different in the way of governmental charters. This novelty was in provisions which specifically stated that certain institutions and human relations were to be left outside the authority of government. They actually forbade the government to infringe or violate these areas.

Strangely enough, not many Americans are aware of the fact that the concept of government confinement and individual freedom had never before been incorporated into a national constitution. And, unfortunately, not enough Americans today realize the wisdom and foresight that went into the framing of the U.S. Constitution.

Freedom today—as always—is dependent upon government confinement for freedom can only be drained away through the concentration of authority. This was well understood by the framers of our Constitution. They distrusted government. What they had read of history gave them the sure knowledge that the power of government is always a dangerous weapon regardless of who holds it. And so they took out insurance against concentration and misuse of authority. They laid the groundwork for actual pursuit and practice of individual freedom in the development of a society and a nation. They understood that what could never have been accomplished under a condition of servitude is the almost natural result of a condition of freedom. They knew that human nature is unchanging and that it is so designed that men are only at their best when they are permitted to live like men.

Let me emphasize that these men to whom the world owes so much were not guessing at a form of government that would work in the wilderness. They had experienced various forms of despotism and tyranny and studied others. They knew that the most progress is made when men have been released from bondage, given control over their own actions, and allowed to receive the fruits of their labor. They acted accordingly and the result is the American miracle and the finest heritage it is possible for men to bequeath.

And with that bequest, an enormous power has come down to you which carries with it the requirement that you protect it zealously and use it wisely.

Our great Republic, with all that it represents of hope and freedom in the world, will be what you make it. Its traditions and principles, its institutions of religious liberty, of educational and economic opportunity, of Constitutional rights, of the integrity of the law, are the most precious possessions of the human race. As our forefathers recognized, these things do not come from government. They are bestowed by God and their abiding place is with the people.

And in stressing your responsibility, I would remind you that our way of life, our economics, our republican form of government are not the result of accident or fortuitous circumstances. They came from hard-bitten, experienced men who could face facts, meet responsibilities and were willing to grapple with just such realities as we find ourselves confronted with today. From such men came the sturdy time-tested foundations on which our country was built and which are today the main supports of our freedom and our prosperity. From them came the flower of civilization with its guarantees of liberty, its enormous material resources and its creative genius.

America is much more than a geographical location or a seat in the United Nations. It is a combination and a relationship. It is the destiny of a masterful, pioneering people, enduring all the hardships of settling a new country, determined to be free. It is the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, with a system of local self-government. It is development and progress on the farm, in the factory, in the mine. It is the creation of worldwide commerce and the opening of vast lines of travel by sea, land, and air.

Our country is truly the result of man's incomprehensible triumph after 6,000 years—a triumph of human progress which conferred on its people untold material wealth, military strength, and spiritual rewards.

And think of the people who did all this. They were drawn from the world at large. They came from many nations, speaking many languages, holding to various traditions. But they met in this continent with a common goal—freedom. And out of the confusion of tongues, the conflict of traditions, the vast differences of tastes and talents, they evolved a spiritual union grounded in liberty that was to become the first model, later the example and now the hope of the entire world.

And this is what we fight for and with today in the great crisis of freedom which has split the world into armed ideological camps, threatening our national survival and devolving on you and young people just like you the job of holding high the torch of freedom in a new and perilous era.

I would remind you of this today as you prepare to go forth to new fields of endeavor. You will hear an increasing amount of talk about change—about how we as a government and we as a people, must change. And I will not argue against change. I think change is necessary and that we should constantly work for changes in our methods and procedures that will improve things, that will better our lives, that will make more secure the blessings of freedom in this country. And, I would suggest to you graduates that you do not improve or change things for the better by discarding basic and proven doctrines.

For example, there have been great changes in this university over the years—changes directed at providing you with better facilities, better instruction, better surroundings. But, there has been no change in the tradition of scholarship and truth upon which this university was established. That is enduring because it has been tried and found good, because it is basic to the purpose of education and citizenship.

So, I would urge you to work for change as you go out in the world. Work for the right kind of change—the kind that will be positive and helpful in charting the right course for your lives and the Nation's life—but don't tamper with the natural laws and the fundamentals that have been tested and proven. There are too many voices in America today suggesting that we change our historic concept of freedom by turning over more and more power to the Federal Government.

There is also a preoccupation with a subject called "national goals," which I find disconcerting because it presupposes that we don't have a national goal sufficient to the realities of today. This, however, is not true. We have a national goal and have had a national goal which is the finest ever devised. It is contained in the words of Thomas Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence when he wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Now I submit that there can be no other national goal than the one contained in the Declaration of Independence, because if we change that, we must change our entire concept of freedom as coming from God and we must alter our entire course of government to conform.

To me this emphasis on seeking after new national goals is a symptom of the disease that ails freedom today. It is a result of man's constant and determined seeking after material things to the exclusion of spiritual values. I suggest that we have become so preoccupied for the last 30 years with the siren call of material goods that cosmetics and TV sets have become more important to many people than freedom of speech.

Those who cry the loudest for basic changes—changes in our economic system, in our Constitution, in our traditions—do not understand the crisis of our time or the anatomy of all crises down through history. They do not want to admit that man with his unchanging nature is the cause of crisis. The problem is man. Conditions are caused by men and they change from day to day, in the world, in the Nation, on Main Street, and in this university—but the nature of the individual does not change. That nature, with all of its imperfection, is the same today as it was 5,000 years ago. Therefore, what man did in history in response to certain conditions, circumstances and philosophies, he will do again today. If it were possible to pass a law which could remove the greed, hatred, envy, and other unfavorable characteristics of man's nature, we could easily fit the individual to whatever conditions that arise. We could make man forever noble and gear him to perform always at an honorable peak of efficiency and endeavor. We could make things so perfect that there would be no need for laws or government.

But this is patently impossible, so we must reckon with the nature of man as it is, realizing that some men have an insatiable desire for power and must be restrained. This is what our Constitution is aimed at—the prevention of concentrations of power into the hands of a few who might abuse it. This is the concept of limited government upon which our individual freedom depends. And, it is just as valid and just as workable today as it was 200 years ago when it was framed by men who had studied and learned from the past—men who had taken the lessons of history and used them profitably as an applied science—men who recognized the eternal reality of rights bestowed at birth on all men.

So, if there is one central thought that I would leave you on this important day in your lives, it is the thought that history contains answers to the present and the future—not only for you as individuals, but for this Nation, this world and all mankind. If you study it well and continue to study it right on through life, you will understand the motivating forces of human progress. You will avoid other men's mistakes in carving a brighter future. And you will be worthier sons of freedom than some of us who have gone before you and—through complacency and inattention to the lessons written in the sands of time—have allowed a process of erosion to begin in the structure of our greatness.

Now before I close I want to congratulate you one and all on the successful completion of your studies in the fine, proud institution of higher education. This is an accomplishment of which I cannot boast but which I have wished a thousand times over that I could. It is an accomplishment that has tested your industry, your perseverance, and your ability. It has proven that you can get along and hold your own in a society of free men and women. And, it has marked you as a part of that group from which our future leaders will be drawn.

This, I say to you, is no small accomplishment. It is one from which I hope you all draw the last full measure of pride in the sure knowledge of a job well done. Thank you and good luck.

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, TO ANNUAL UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an address I delivered before the annual United Press International Conference of Editors and Publishers on June 9, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 9, 1961

Mr. Chairman, editors, publishers, and guests, it is both an honor and a pleasure for me to be here today to participate in this important conference of UPI executives and subscribers. I am honored because of the high regard I have for the important positions you hold in world of public expression. And I am pleased because of the cordiality and intelligence which I never fail to encounter in my meetings with members of the press. Now I can't say that talking with newspapermen is exactly a rare experience for me these days, but I can say that I am seldom able to corner this many high-caliber newsmen at one time in one place.

I almost addressed you as fellow newspapermen but then I decided that you probably hadn't invited me here to discuss the problems I encounter with my own newspaper column. However, I think you should know that I pay close attention to my column and the subject of news these days in light of developments along the whole broad front which Washington likes to refer to as public relations.

First and foremost among these developments is the furor being raised over just who should censor what news and why. And on this I shall have something more to say in the course of my remarks. The second development is the administration's concern over getting President Kennedy's name into each and every Government press release. Now I can sympathize here. In fact, I'm thinking of issuing an order that no press release can go out of my Senate office unless it contains the name "GOLDWATER." And, of course, the third reason why I am concentrating a little harder on my editorial duties is the awe-inspiring and complimentary knowledge that Ralph McGill's Atlanta Constitution has become one of the newest subscribers to my column. I can only say that this latter development is sufficient to give any new struggling conservative pundit reason to pause and consider well his words.

There has been a great deal of talk in recent months about challenge, and I believe you gentlemen may have taken it to heart in arranging this program. For, it is certainly something of a challenge for a mere Republican Senator to find himself in the position of "clean-up man" in a batting lineup drawn exclusively from the New Frontier. But I want you to know that I welcome this opportunity for rebuttal, if that is what it is, because it strikes me that if you have heard anything critical of national policy in the last day and a half it is strictly a case of "man bites dog." I promise you that I shall have some words of criticism—not only based on my own appraisal of what is transpiring today, but also based on what I hear from the people across the length and breadth of America. But it will be criticism that stems from deep conviction and which I believe must be heard for the good of our Nation and the cause of freedom everywhere.

It is customary, I know, when a public official or a politician speaks to a group of influential newspapermen to wax eloquent on the subject of freedom of the press and heap fulsome, oratorical praise upon his captive audience. Well I expect to have some well chosen words concerning freedom in general and freedom of the press in particular, but my high regard for your profession is so well known that I hardly think I need take up your valuable time by restating it this afternoon. And while I may have some suggestions as to how I think the press can help the cause of freedom in our present situation there is no intention on my part to tell you how to run your newspapers.

For some reason we don't hear as much today as we used to about the power of the press. But to my way of thinking this does not mean that there has been any lessening of that power. If anything, I believe that the progress we have seen in other mediums of news expression, such as radio and television, has increased the power of the press through whetting the public appetite for the printed word. I believe far more people comprehend and retain what they read than what they hear. Consequently when people hear some item of news that interests them they immediately want to read about it, and their recourse is to the latest edition of their local paper.

Yes, we have a powerful press in this country which got that way through hard work and its freedom recognized by the Bill of Rights. And I believe this fact places upon the press of this country a solemn duty to defend freedom wherever it is threatened and from whatever source the peril arises. This responsibility, I submit, goes beyond the confines of freedom of the press and encompasses all the liberties that are conferred on men by God and which were fully recognized and protected in the Constitution.

In this particular period in our history, I believe the threats are many and varied. Some are easy to recognize and combat. For example, when it is suggested that the need exists for "far greater official secrecy" in the Government of the United States, the probable confinement of the people's right to know is fully apparent. Here is something that champions of freedom of the press can come to grips with and combat in the free-swinging fashion at which they are so adept. I am not suggesting for one minute that this is not a dangerous threat merely because it is easily recognized. On the contrary, I believe too much official secrecy is just as dangerous today as it was in the days of Yalta and Potsdam, when the people were denied the right to know and the results placed a heavy mortgage on the destiny of freedom for all mankind. Official secrecy, historically, has been the instrument of big, centralized government in its growth toward totalitarianism and tyranny. It is to be avoided at all costs because the mere concept is far more dangerous than the revelation of any information that it is erected to hide.

But there are other threats, too—threats that are subtle and difficult to recognize because they stem from failure to act or are encased in appealing disguises and promoted under the false name of need or crisis or emergency. They are threats that have been eating away at our freedom, our determination, our industry, and our incentive. These threats go to the very taproots of our national character and sap our traditional strength to the point where we lose sight of our heritage and go groping around in a quest for new national goals. I suggest that we don't need new national goals. We have one which was written for us by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and it is the goal of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is the supreme goal of all Americans. And it endures as a goal because its achievement takes constant effort. As we examine that goal today, we find that we have life but that our liberty is threatened and, with it, our ability to pursue happiness.

Of course, the great overall threat to our liberty today comes from the forces of international communism as they push their protracted drive to conquer the United States and dominate the world. On a tactical plane, the Communists have dwarfed our concept of the world struggle with a long-range strategy of total war flexible enough to permit the interchangeable use of both military and political weapons. Theirs is an integrated plan aimed at world conquest which never changes and which makes the maximum use of territorial attrition and turns the passage of time into their stanchest ally.

While the Communists have been waging a new kind of total war with every means at their command—economic, psychological, paramilitary, and subversive—we have been treating the whole thing like a part-time project, turning our attention from one brush-fire zone to another in direct response to Russian maneuvers. They call the tune while we dance. They select the areas of conflict and we hurry to them with weakness rather than with our effective weapons. They use whatever set of ground rules that happen to suit the circumstances and we are forced to comply.

I suggest that we have been reacting frantically and separately to each Communist move as though it were a situation entirely apart from Soviet grand strategy. We have been swatting one fly at a time and now the room is full of flies. We have been content with a patchwork, outmoded foreign policy which reeks of hesitation and uncertainty and ineptitude and which rests on an almost infantile belief that—short of a clearly defined shooting war with Russia—we can expect our adversary to negotiate and deal with a semblance of honor.

It is certainly time for a change here. It is time for us to grasp the true dimensions of the all-out war we are engaged in, and I believe that the press of the Nation can perform a great service in this respect by helping our people to enlarge their thinking on this critical issue. The need is for a policy grounded on strength which is willing to run some risk in the cause of freedom. It is long past the time for us to think in terms of containment and peaceful coexistence. International communism cannot be contained with talk and treaty and this has been proved to our dismay over and over again in almost every part of the world. Nor is there such a thing as peaceful coexistence. What we have been fooled into thinking were brief periods of cold war peace in the past—periods when the rantings of Khrushchev were muted and Russia was throwing us a few diplomatic bones—were actually periods of Soviet aggression

under a different disguise. They were also periods of defeat for the forces of freedom.

We cannot allow ourselves to forget for a single minute that the neverchanging aim of the Soviet Union is world domination and to that end the Communists are bending all the efforts of a regimented society. The Soviets are not interested in containing freedom; they want to destroy it. The Soviets do not want peaceful coexistence with the forces of freedom; they want to exterminate the forces of freedom. Their aim is consistent while ours is just the reverse. We meet the menace of international communism with all conceivable types of reaction. For a while, we resist vigorously in full keeping with an attitude worthy of the champion of freedom. Then we move on with various doctrines aimed at containment of communism. Then we enter periods in which we begin to believe the myth of peaceful coexistence—periods interspersed with rapprochements and dententes and futile negotiation. We waste our determination, our energy, and our substance in exploring paths of least resistence—and always to be brought up short and frightened by a new display of Communist duplicity and aggression.

The great need today is for leadership and direction to bring the great might of this Nation to bear on the No. 1 objective—the winning of the cold war. A stalemate will not suffice for there is no such thing as maintaining the status quo in a conflict where the other side never rests. This Nation desperately needs an official statement of our objective and a priority list of what is needed to meet that objective.

And against this need, the administration is following a policy of almost calculated confusion. It is giving the country "government by crisis" but the "crises" it propounds are not the ones that really count in the crucial test of freedom's survival. It has been moving from one Presidential message to another, switching its emphasis from one imaginary emergency to another with such rapidity that not even the Congress can make head or tail of the true needs of this Nation. It started out by arousing the country with thousands of words about unemployment and an economic "crisis." It jammed through legislation on unemployment compensation benefits, minimum wage, and depressed areas—none of which has yet, or will in the future, create one new job in the United States. Then it turned on the heat for Federal aid to education and again the argument was "crisis." It made original requests for space, defense, and foreign aid funds and now it wants more of everything. While the Nation is absorbed with a genuine crisis in Cuba and Latin America, the administration proposes going to the moon by a new, $9 billion route.

At a time when our people are in critical need of the uniting force of strong leadership with a clear purpose and a consistent policy, the New Frontier is changing signals so fast the scouts are confused. It came to office with a clear pledge to let the people know what goes on in the offices of government and promptly clamped down on the flow of information. It replaced promises of freedom of information with attacks—first on the press of the Nation and then on the radio and television industry—and with suggestions for censorship. It came to office firmly opposed to summit meetings based on vague speculative hopes, but the President has already been to Vienna to talk with Khrushchev. It came to office deploring 11th hour responses to Soviet-created crises, but has been engaging in just such responses in Laos, Cuba, and elsewhere throughout the world.

These actions have not only confused our people, but some of them have divided the people on issues of grave importance to our survival as a nation and to the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Let's take the case of the tractor deal, for example. Regardless of how you rate the legality or the propriety of a committee of private citizens stepping up to collect blackmail funds for Castro, by getting into the act the President has done a disservice to the American people. He has aggravated a situation where people are violently and emotionally concerned. And he has added to the confusion over just what, if anything, he plans to do about communism in Cuba.

This is particularly unfortunate coming at the time that it does. I say this because I believe the disaster attendant to our participation in the abortive and ill-fated invasion attempt in Cuba did more to wake up the American people to the true nature of Communist menace off our Florida coast than anything else could have done. When possible, I like to look on the bright side of things, and while it was a difficult task to find anything positive about the invasion fiasco I believe the reaction of the people was one of them. After that incident, I detected for the first time—in my mail and in my conversations with people throughout the country—an awakening to the true, unmistakable meaning of the Castro regime. I also recognized a determination and a willingness to do anything that the President should decide was needed to meet this threat head-on.

These people, and I am sure they were typical of all Americans, wanted action and they were encouraged by Mr. Salinger's announcement that the government was considering a full embargo of Cuba and by the President's brave words to another group of American newspapermen which seemed to restate the Monroe Doctrine. I believe they became somewhat restive and discouraged at the delay in developing anything like a firm policy with regard to Castro in the immediate wake of the invasion fiasco, but there was also a reasonableness about it which recognized that as a nation the situation required caution and planning.

However, I firmly believe that the last thing they expected was the spectacle of our Government sanctioning a response to the blackmail demands of a Communist dictator against whom they were united as never before. Anyway you slice it, this presented the world with a picture of American people scrambling around to dig up the price to pay off a bush-league tyrant on his own terms. It is true that we owe a debt to those Cuban patriots who sought to free their native land with ineffective and misleading help from the United States, but we owe them more than to strengthen their enslaver so that he can push his subversive designs throughout the Western Hemisphere. We owe it to them and to all freedom-loving people throughout the world to develop a firm policy which will speak from strength and countenance no bowing to Communist demands.

And, in this connection, I suggest that we have a right to wonder at the role of Mr. Edward R. Murrow in the present scheme of things. As the head of the U.S. Information Agency, it was my understanding that his job was to promote the cause of freedom and explain the purposes of the United States in other areas of the world. However, we find him on our TV screens handling a purely domestic assignment designed to pull the administration's chestnuts out of the fire on the Castro-tractor deal. It seems to me that if official policy is so shaky that the offices of the USIA have to be utilized to sell it to our own people then that policy should be abandoned in favor of one that the American people can support of their own accord and without benefit of Government-paid hucksters.

So, as I have pointed out, we are confronted today with crises, some of which are real and dangerous and some of which are manufactured and political. And we have confusion—official confusion—which is dimming our sights and draining our effectiveness as a Nation. I can think of no greater service that you gentlemen and the press generally could perform at this particular time in our history than to bend your best efforts to clarifying the situation that confronts us. For, I am convinced that our people need to know what is a real crisis and what is a crisis only in the minds of the New Frontier and the pressure groups which support its various programs. I suggest that a message from the White House, no matter how long and no matter how it is presented, does not, of itself, comprise a crisis. And the time has come for all of us—you people as newsmen, and we as members of Congress—to examine with the greatest care each new proposal presented in the name of emergency. But we can't do everything—in the field of space, defense, foreign aid, social welfare, etc.—and still retain the strength we need to meet the challenge of our destiny.

I repeat that the threat to our liberty comes not only from the forces of international communism. Some of it comes from within and is attributable almost directly to our inattention to the lessons of history as they apply to the present and the future.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about socialism being just around the corner. This is, to put it plainly, pure hogwash. Socialism is much closer than the next corner. In fact, the blueprint for completing the gradualism of Fabian attrition is speeding through the Congress at this very moment. And this is a battle of freedom which we are losing almost by default to the advocates of more and greater government control over the lives and affairs of all Americans. You can measure it by the declining value of the dollar—now worth 47 cents of the 1939 dollar and due to drop fast under the impact of new and costly government programs.

In this connection, I suggest that you editors and publishers have two concerns. One is the concern of the economic realities that face all businessmen. The other is the responsibility which freedom of the press places upon your very capable shoulders. But the two are related—in fact, they are indivisible. For what does freedom of the press mean, if you who use and protect it are deprived of the money needed to pay your workers, to buy presses, newsprint, and the other tools of your trade? Make no mistake about it, freedom of the press is dependent upon full economic freedom. Unless we have a society in which the producer enjoys the fruits of his labor, our freedom is impaired and this goes for freedom of the press just as much as it does for all our other cherished freedoms.

Now, as producers, how long are you going to enjoy a reasonable portion of the fruits of your efforts? How long do you think it will be before all of these new Government welfare programs bring higher taxes and inflated costs? I don't think I have to tell you that the amounts presently attached to Government spending programs—as great as they are in a debt-burdened economy—are only a drop in the bucket to what the outlay will be in future years. You know, of course, that the pattern has been set in minimum wage legislation—a pattern that has jettisoned a rule of interstate commerce in the application of government intereference with business, with the natural laws of profit and loss, with the doctrine that a worker is worthy of his hire. I'm sure you know, too, that the $1.25 minimum is just as temporary as was the $1 minimum. This is because the minimum wage law is subject to political pressure and has become a device for pressuring wages in an ever upward spiral—not only in the minimum categories of our marginal workers but all the way up the line. Wage differentials must be maintained, and this is an argument well understood by union organizers and negotiators. In fact,

minimum wage is the base on which bargaining is conducted.

With the passage of the minimum wage bill and the depressed areas bill, I would say the Government toook a long step toward the point where it will be able to control, by Executive order, not only prices, wages, working conditions, and hours, but even the places of employment. I believe the Government has the power under the depressed areas bill to move industry from one locality to another if employment demands are such to make the action appear justifiable.

But these are items of legislation which have already been passed by a Congress almost completely subservient to administration demands. And, bad as I believe they are, I say very candidly that the worst is still to come. The demands made by the President in his second state of the Union message are truly frightening when appraised in terms of further deficit spending, higher taxes, and runaway inflation. The New Frontier admits the cost will be high but assures us that the adventure will be exciting. And believe me, the adventure will be exciting if this latest symphony of spending is ever enacted into law. It could go right through the roof of our national economy and fly formation with the astronaut on his flight to the moon.

Actually, and this is the truly frightening aspect, nobody—least of all the administration—seems to know what the ultimate cost of these programs will be. The inflation built into them, of and by itself, will double and triple original estimates. And one of those original estimates, you will recall, was between $7 billion and $9 billion over the next 5 years for space projects alone.

Our Republican researchers have tried in vain to place a realistic price tag on this excess of programs that have rained down on the Congress in special Presidential messages. They became completely bogged down in a profusion of hidden authorizations, contractual commitments, projected loans, and subsidies. But unofficial estimates—based on the New Frontier's own minimum estimates—has put the 5-year additional cost of administration programs in the neighborhood of $60 billion. By 1965, this would give us a Federal budget of $125 billion.

The figure alone is appalling, but it is nothing compared with what it actually means to every man, woman, and child in this country, now and in the future. Figure it out for yourselves. President Eisenhower's last budget amounted to $81 billion and just to support that rate of expenditure, our people paid enormous taxes and put up with a high rate of inflation. What will happen to tax rates and the purchasing power of the dollar when we add $60 billion to that load?

This is not fantasy. It is fact—cold, hard fact upon which the future of our Nation and our way of life might well depend. It is a fact to which you people, as moulders of public opinion, should pay close heed in the months directly ahead, because a great deal can be determined about our course as a nation in what the Congress does in that period. One of the things to be determined is whether our lawmakers will go along with this mammoth additional spending program without demanding that action be taken to offset some of the space and defense outlays with cuts in nonessential areas of Government operations.

The New Frontier wants it both ways. It wants the greatest space and defense programs ever contemplated and it wants the greatest welfare state program at the same time. It wants to accelerate public spending in every old category and many new ones, and it wants to do this without any corresponding cut-back in Government waste or in our scandalous foreign economic aid programs. It wants the American public to view everything—from unemployment to a man on the moon, and from education to fallout shelters—in terms of "crises," and it wants the people to meet these co-called emergencies in a way that will drain our national strength.

Earlier I told you that our people are divided on many important issues. President Kennedy finds the same thing. In his pre-summit statement in Paris he expressed the hope that Khrushchev would recognize that the United States—and here I quote—"Divided as it may be on many important questions, including governmental spending, is united in its determination to fulfill its commitments."

I suggest that this division may become important to the administration, because if the American people ever become fully aware of what is being done to them, and to their children and to their grandchildren through increased Government spending, we will see a new frontier of public protest that will dwarf anything ever experienced by a previous national regime.

Gentlemen, there is a breaking point and I believe the American people are reaching it more rapidly than is generally supposed. They are beginning to suspect the New Frontier has been struck with "moonmadness" and that their heritage and their future is being placed in hock at the whim of men who, in the very reactionary fashion which they decry, are trying to take us back to the 1930's and the failure-ridden economic remedies of that period.

We can't continue to fumble and hope in the field of international relations any more than we can continue to throw away the substance of our might on unnecessary programs at home. We can't be strong in a way that will command world respect without maintaining our economic balance to support that strength.

We can't even hope to win the cold war unless we cut through the present fog of confusion, and embark on a realistic program designed to outreach the Communists in audacity and purpose. To do this, we need the blessings of God, the wisdom of prudence, and the determination of freemen.

THE MODERN NATO PHILOSOPHY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, probably many people in our Nation still think of NATO as an organization whose concerns are limited to the geography of the Atlantic Community countries.

It is true that the NATO alliance was originally conceived as a counteragent to the Communist threat in Europe. But over the 12 years since they were brought together in this compact, the NATO nations have always realized that the aims of communism are global; they have, at the same time, accepted their larger responsibilities for countering these aims.

Indeed, NATO thinks and reckons and plans in the same broad context in which President Kennedy spoke to us just the other day about our own national responsibilities for meeting the Communist threat.

The New York Herald Tribune summarized the modern NATO philosophy in an editorial on May 12, which I commend to all Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATO THINKS GLOBALLY

The meeting of the NATO Foreign Ministers in Oslo was not the first in which the 15 nations of the Atlantic community looked at the worldwide political, economic, scientific, and psychological aspects of the menace that confronts them. NATO has never existed in a vacuum; it has always been aware that the Soviet Union and international communism posed threats to Western Europe and North America far outside the geographical limits of those areas.

But never before the Oslo meeting has NATO faced up to these facts so clearly. Has the change been brought about because of changes in the nature of the Communist threat, or through changes in NATO?

The answer is "Yes" to both questions. When NATO was formed 12 years ago, it was in direct response to a military challenge by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe—a challenge that had already insured the communization of nearly every country on the U.S.S.R.'s border, under the guns of the Red army. That threat still exists. But under Nikita Khrushchev's direction the Soviet Union (and Red China, acting in large part on its own), have multiplied the methods and the regions threatened by communism.

But it is not the Soviet Union alone that has changed. One rather ironic reason that NATO now can turn its eyes to other parts of the world than the North Atlantic Basin is that the commitments of its members have actually been sharply reduced in Asia and Africa during the past dozen years.

The idea of NATO as a regional organization was based in large part upon the conception that the members had a fundamental identity of cultural and even political heritage. But this was probably not a decisive limiting factor; Turkey, whose history lay outside the European tradition, was eventually admitted as a full member of NATO. More important was the need to reassure NATO members that the Organization's strength would not be used to bolster the British Commonwealth, or the French Union (as it was then termed) or to forward far-ranging American interests.

As new nations were rapidly formed out of the older empires, it has become easier to convince the NATO group that the concern of France, for example, in southeast Asia is over a Red threat to the free nations there rather than over the fate of French Indochina. The same is true in respect to the Netherlands, Belgium, and Britain, as their former colonies have been freed.

To be sure, some nations in NATO have more specific interests in the Far East or the Middle East or North Africa than others. There is by no means full agreement on policies toward, say, Red China among all NATO members. A number of them are probably still preoccupied with European affairs, almost to the exclusion of the rest of the world, and certainly the most difficult and dangerous situation confronting NATO, as such, is Berlin, rather than Laos.

Consequently no one can yet predict how effective NATO will be outside its original sphere. Indeed, it is not easy to know how effective it will be there. But broadening the NATO horizon is a useful, in fact an essential, step toward bringing order to a world that is shot through with omens of chaos and war.

DEATH OF DANIEL WEBSTER HOAN, FORMER MAYOR OF MILWAUKEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, the former mayor of Milwaukee, Daniel Webster Hoan, died.

Daniel Hoan was mayor of Milwaukee from 1916 to 1940. He was, in the judgment of observers—whether liberal or conservative, regardless of the party to which they belonged—a truly great mayor of Milwaukee, and one of the greatest mayors in the history of the United States.

I should like to read briefly from an article which appeared in Newsweek magazine for April 18, 1936:

April 1910, Daniel Webster Hoan, a gangling young ex-chef with a knowledge of Marxian socialism, dived into politics and came up in the office of city attorney.

April 1916, popular and credited with an efficient record, he took over the mayor's office.

April 1936, Daniel Hoan faced at least 4 more years in the mayoralty. In last week's election, the city's voters elected him for the seventh consecutive time.

Halo: Milwaukee's perennial mayor had come to wear a halo. Since he first sat down at his desk in the German-style city hall, Milwaukee had grown famous as a "wonder city." Its ever-solvent financial condition, its competent police force, its record-low insurance rates, and its many efficient government branches had made it a model municipality.

With Milwaukee, Dan Hoan climbed to fame. More than a title, Hoan had a personality. A quiet, homey man with a reputation for integrity, he was a wonder on the speaker's platform. His neat sense of humor, challenging voice, and repertoire of fascinating gestures could hold any audience.

People who would never dream of approving Marxist principles came to support Marx's disciple, the mayor. Labor backed him almost solidly. Groups of the "better classes" even grew to consider it socially smart to vote for Dan Hoan. In election after election, he swept to victory.

Mr. President, Dan Hoan had become an institution in Milwaukee. He was elected as a Socialist; but he provided Milwaukee with about the most efficient and the most responsible government any major American city has ever had. Dan Hoan was mayor at a time when many American cities were suffering from racketeer domination. Yet there was no racketeering and no organized crime in Milwaukee. Its crime rate was extremely low. The record of its fire department and the record of all its other operations were remarkable examples to the Nation.

Mr. President, in 1936, Time magazine, in a rare tribute, a cover story which I hope to insert in the RECORD later, called Dan Hoan one of the truly outstanding mayors in the history of the United States.

Yesterday, Dan Hoan died. I am sure that all the people of Wisconsin, both those who are residents of Milwaukee and those who reside in other parts of the State, feel a very deep loss.

In his later years, Dan Hoan became an active adviser to the Democratic Party in Wisconsin. He had a wonderful sense of humor. He was a fine, thoughtful, dedicated human being. He originally became a Socialist, I presume, because he had a deep impulse to achieve equality and justice for all mankind. His record was one of absolute, scrupulous, undeviating honesty. He served our city and our State very well.

OFFENSIVE STRATEGY TO WIN THE COLD WAR AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina and also associate editor of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., has written an excellent article entitled "The Strategy of Counterrevolution: A Special Report on Paramilitary Operations." This article appeared in the Bulletin of the institute, and I take pleasure in calling this to the attention of the Senate. This article points out that it is imperative that the United States change its policy of merely trying to contain communism and adopt an offensive strategy to win the cold war being waged by the forces of international communism. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the stated purpose of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina is "to advance knowledge of the national security needs of the United States, especially in Latin America and Africa, and to help Americans to view foreign policy questions in the light of strategic realities." I commend Mr. Harrigan and his associates for establishing this institute and also for the great contribution they are making to a better public understanding of strategic issues confronting our country through the publication of the Bulletin, the institute's official publication. The address of the institute is Box 2053, Charleston, S.C.

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

STRATEGY OF COUNTERREVOLUTION

(By Anthony Harrigan)

In the classic words of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, "There is no substitute for victory."

It is imperative, therefore, that the United States adopt an offensive strategy to win the cold war being waged by the forces of international communism.

Since the late 1940's, official U.S. policy has been one of containment of communism. But containment in reality is a policy of sitting in foxholes waiting for the enemy to strike. This kind of defensive posture does not win wars; it certainly won't bring victory in a conflict of unparalleled fierceness.

The American strategy must be that of the late George Patton—to attack, attack, and then attack again—keeping the enemy off balance never giving time to gather his strength. This kind of strategy, translated into action on a global scale, can defeat an enemy that has a dynamism of his own.

First let's clearly define the enemy the United States faces in these perilous days. This enemy is not simply a national state. To see the war in these terms is to regard the conflict as a narrow, legalistic struggle between two peoples. This is not a war that can be avoided by diplomatic maneuvering or by allotment of spheres of influence.

The enemy the United States must defeat to survive has been aptly described as "a gray consortium of international unofficial organizations, possessing the attributes of several states both great and small, allied by a basic ideology, equipped by a single doctrine of combat, and swelling into mass movements in many areas."

This force cannot be defeated by nuclear weapons alone or by foreign policy arrangements. Not only is it built on state power but on a Communist philosophy and a doctrine of partisan warfare. These are fused together into an ideology and battle doctrine that must be smashed everywhere on the globe by a counteraction involving military power and political know-how.

It is necessary to consider the history of Russia and China. The ideology and battle doctrine enabled revolutionaries to capture the state apparatus of two ancient nations and to harness their peoples to the movement.

Neither the Russians nor the Chinese, prior to the First World War, could have been predicted as units in this kind of movement. The Communists were a tiny minority in Russia. The Chinese Communists overcame a culture profoundly antagonistic to everything that communism stands for.

But in both countries, communism triumphed, as it has triumphed in Cuba—another country with an unreceptive culture.

Communism has been characterized as a "monolith in motion, a force of doctrinal and operational unity."

The national policy objective of the United States, if it is to survive, is to shatter this Communist unity. The way to shatter it is to turn its own weapons against the Communist colossus. Indeed communism is peculiarly vulnerable to the methods it employs against others.

Marxism mobilizes the masses. The United States must do the same thing, and in the underdeveloped countries where Communists are making gains. If we do not succeed in reaching the minds of these people, neither foreign aid nor conventional military force can prevent their conquest.

The world situation requires that the United States be genuinely convinced: (1) That it is in a state of global war, and (2) that it must carry out large-scale guerrilla and political war in vital areas of the underdeveloped world.

In short, the United States must create resistance movements with the dynamism to defeat communism. This should not be too difficult in a sense for when people are ripe for the mass movement of communism it is likely they also are ripe for other kinds of mass movements.

As someone has observed, a Saul turning into a Paul is neither a rarity nor a miracle. Proselytizing mass movements see all antagonists as potential converts. The masses of Cubans who scream for Fidel Castro may be violently anti-Castro 5 years hence if the United States masters the principles of political mobilization. Mass movements are interchangeable. A revolution can become a counterrevolution. Organizing a counterrevolution to communism must become the national goal of the United States.

The U.S. goal, in the Caribbean for instance, should be to replace Castro-Communist governments with regimes friendly to the United States. The need in each country under Communist domination will be to build effective resistance forces.

The tactics required will be to keep the Castro Communist forces off balance so that the United States will act and the enemy will be on the defensive.

The guiding tactics of the counterrevolution against Castro communism should be—

To concentrate attention and strength in the countryside as Mao did in China;

To use small guerrilla forces in many places with the goal of disruption and shock;

To isolate the enemy from the people in a given country, seeking to demoralize the foe.

These are the principles of guerrilla war cited by Ernesto Guevara in Cuba. He cited three fundamentals: (1) Civilian forces can win a war against an army; (2) one should not await every favorable condition for initiating a revolution; the insurrectional center can be created; and (3) in the underdeveloped parts of the Americas, the terrain of the area indicates that the heart of the struggle should be in the rural regions.

The main thing to remember is that the Communist lives in the fires of combined military and political conflict. U.S. forces must do the same thing—accept the idea of the long conflict.

At present, this kind of existence is alien to both civilians and military in America. Drastic revision in thinking is needed and in short order. We must adjust to the idea of permanent revolution and the permanent counterrevolution.

The United States must purposely take up the weapons and battle doctrine of guerrilla-politwar on a global scale. Our failure to do is our gap in our national preparedness.

While the enemy works on politwar day and night, we only toy with such efforts. As a result, the Communists have things pretty much their own way, despite our vast expenditures on conventional arms—which aren't stopping the expansion of the Communist world.

Unconventional warfare using the Communist battle system of guerrillas plus propaganda and mass mobilization is a relatively inexpensive weapon. The weapon exists. It only has to be used with knowledge, imagination, and determination. The United States could engage in this kind of warfare around the globe at a fraction of the cost of a few hydrogen bombs. Units already exist in the U.S. Army which are capable of implementing such a new national strategy. Increased in size and given a new directive, they could move the United States toward victory over communism.

In taking up such a strategy, however, Americans must realize they cannot expect establishment of order and security such as they knew in earlier eras. Decent conditions of life will return only when communism is extinguished on this globe. For as many years as one can see ahead, there will be need for an offensive against communism.

This means something new for American military men—the need to practice protracted war in the midst of populations of distant countries. The United States has not had to do this on a large scale since the Indian wars. But Americans did it then, and won. They can do it again and win again—this time against a strong and sophisticated foe.

The Communists are in the business of organizing violence. Americans can learn to be conflict managers. Counterguerrillas are the only answer to guerrillas; the only answer to Communist organization is an equally strong counterrevolutionary organization. Guns are needed, but so are soldiers who can mobilize minds and operate a state within a state far from home.

These strategic demands are remote from current American experience. But it is a fact that the survival of a nation depends upon how well it can adapt itself to new situations and upon its ability to confront and solve problems. If the American Republic survives, it will be because we have mastered the enemy's methods, drawn on our reserves of nerve and intelligence and organizing ability, and courageously tackled grave problems. The ability of the American people and Armed Forces to be successful in the long pull, in nerve-wracking sacrifice and struggle, is the key to determining whether the United States will survive enemy assault and carry out effective counterattack that leads to victory for the United States of America.

A STRONG FRANCE IS ALSO OUR STRENGTH

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I direct attention to a provocative editorial advertisement that appeared in paid space as a public service in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 12, 1961, by International Latex Corp. and its founder Mr. A. N. Spanel. Entitled "A Strong France Is Also Our Strength," this article originally appeared in this newspaper June 19, 1960.

It is a certainty that no private citizen in American history has given so much of himself and of his company in thought, effort, and treasure, in order to establish stronger bonds between the people of the United States and France, as has Mr. Spanel since 1939.

This is the more remarkable when one considers the fact that neither Mr. Spanel nor his company have any business interests, directly or indirectly in France.

Such constructive efforts, now so widely known throughout the free world, merit not only encouragement, but the highest recognition everywhere.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 12, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

A STRONG FRANCE IS ALSO OUR STRENGTH

(By A. N. Spanel)

Speculation on the consequences, good and bad, of the fiasco in Paris last month provides a wide spectrum of opinion. But running through it all is the nearly unanimous judgment that France—the revitalized France under General de Gaulle—has emerged from recent events with immensely enhanced prestige and with a strong voice in NATO and free-world affairs.

France can no longer be denied her hard-won status as a world power in the fullest sense of those words. Even spokesmen for the British Government concede that she has acquired political stature equal to Britain's.

The fact is that a new balance of relationships among the democratic nations has been struck. Realities of this character do not call for official confirmation. They are facts of international life. Henceforth, in discussing free-world policies with Washington, Paris will carry no less weight than London.

This represents a significant gain for the democratic coalition, in terms of greater unity and more effective leadership. It means that the tremendous potential that is France—her scientific genius and foreign-policy insights and political wisdom—can be added to the aggregate material and moral strength of the Western alinement.

But that potential could too easily be frittered away if we Americans repeat the old error of taking our friends for granted—of withholding the ounce of prevention that is worth a pound of cure. The iron logic of the new balance must be acknowledged quickly and without ambiguity in the decisive area of modern power; namely, the nuclear-missile area.

Lipservice to French equality in the grand alliance is hypocritical as long as she is excluded from the so-called nuclear club. To continue to treat that country as a junior partner compared with Britain is illogical, unjust, and in the long run could be disastrous.

The need to freeze the size of the nuclear club makes sense; but it no longer applies to France. Even the Soviet draft proposal on this issue (which is in principle acceptable to the United States) leaves the door wide open for France. The relevant paragraph reads:

"States possessing nuclear weapons shall undertake not to transmit such weapons or information necessary for their manufacture to states which do not possess such weapons. At the same time, states which do not possess nuclear weapons shall undertake to refrain from manufacturing them."

France does already possess nuclear weapons. She would not, therefore, be barred from receiving such weapons or nuclear information; neither would she be bound to "refrain from manufacturing" them.

Actually the question is no longer whether France will achieve nuclear parity. The question is simply whether she will do so with American cooperation or despite American refusal to actively cooperate.

Unless the French people are enabled to draw on American nuclear and missile technology on the same basis as Britain, they will be driven to waste great wealth and energy in order to duplicate that technology. The consequent economic weakening of the country would weaken the entire coalition. There is also the foreseeable risk that France, in her national interest, and frustrated by our denial, might be tempted by a possible Kremlin offer to provide the crucial know-how. That, surely, would be a chilling prospect for us all.

In a recent syndicated article, the competent journalist, Eric Sevareid, writes objectively of the new stature of France. "Clearly we all underestimated French technical and organizational capacities," he declares, and proceeds to show how "the undiminished French intellect moved into the vacuum left by Britain's refusal to lead postwar Europe."

He points to a French economic renaissance at least the equal of Germany's in which France has created more industrial output in the last 15 years than in all the previous 150 years since industrialization began. He then reviews the pluses and minuses of the totally new constitutional system, permitting an effective executive for the first time—the revival and dangers inherent in the tradition of French professional soldiery—and the successful Franco-German entente.

He also injects a note of skepticism. After all, he cautions, the new house of France has not had time enough to prove itself. Perhaps the rivets will one day come loose. This is one reason, he says, why the British hesitate to commit their fate—in trade, in atomic science, in defense—to the continental framework.

But if we cannot risk trusting France, our traditional friend and ally, whom shall we trust to lead the Continent? Does not this distrust leave Europe, and therefore the fate of the world, to the tender mercies of the Kremlin? As between the two risks, do we really have any valid alternative but to bring maximum support to the French renaissance?

Mr. Sevareid concludes his article thus: "What we have been seeing is the restoration of free play for the French genius, our creditor often enough in the past."

The task of American statesmanship, surely, is to safeguard and fortify that "free play for the French genius." And the most direct and meaningful way to accomplish this, no less surely, is by granting it full participation in the nuclear-missile age. Failure to do so endangers the magnificent bastion of free-world vitality that is France.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 266, S. 1189.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the bill by title.

TO AUTHORIZE THE COAST GUARD TO CARRY ON CERTAIN OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1189) to amend title 14 of the United States Code in order to authorize the Coast Guard to carry on certain oceanographic research.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

CONFERRING OF HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE ON ROBERT G. BAKER, SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief announcement which I believe will be of interest to the Senate. The genial secretary for the Democratic majority hereafter is to be known as Dr. Baker.

Bobby, as we have been accustomed to calling him, was presented the honorary degree of doctor of laws last night at American University. I had the honor of presenting it. I may say that Dr. Baker a few years ago graduated from the school of law of that university. He was recognized last night with proper honors and was given something that I think was entirely fitting, that is, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. So henceforth it is "Dr. Baker."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join with my distinguished colleague from Alabama in extending felicitations and congratulations to Dr. Robert Baker, who on yesterday was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by American University.

I do not know what I can add to what my colleague has just said to express the pride which we all feel in this most worthwhile accomplishment and honor, which is this young man's just due. What has been awarded to him by his alma mater has been truly earned by one of its most distinguished sons and one of the Senate's, and thereby the country's, most effective and dedicated public servants.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be given the privilege of inserting at this point in the RECORD the citation made at the time of the awarding of the degree.

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

ROBERT G. BAKER

Graduate of the Washington College of Law and therefore a son of this university, you have so distinguished yourself in the political life of this Nation that your alma mater seeks to confer honor upon you tonight. Ever since your appointment as Senate page by the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank in 1942, you have rendered continuous service in various capacities in the Senate. You were the youngest officer ever selected for the position of secretary for the majority, a position which you now hold with distinction. You were selected in 1959 as one of America's 10 outstanding young men. You have been active in political campaigns since 1948 and served as executive director of the Democratic platform committee at the 1956 convention. You were a delegate to the 1960 convention and a leader in the support of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON for the presidency. You have served as secretary to the Democratic conference, the steering committee, and the policy committee. Knowing the esteem in which your colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, hold you as one of our outstanding public servants, it is an unusual pleasure to have the opportunity of awarding to you tonight this honorary degree.

By authority of the Congress of the United States vested in the board of trustees of the American University and by the board of trustees delegated to me, I confer upon you the honorary degree of doctor of laws and invest you with the hood appropriate to this degree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, later this afternoon I shall speak about another individual who was awarded a degree in Vermont, but I shall wait for the proper time to make my position clear on that matter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join in all of the nice things said about a person I consider to be a real friend. Ever since I became a Member of the Senate, I have observed that although he is a Democrat and a stalwart member of the Democratic organization, when he treats with me, a Republican, this does not make any difference. If I had anything to do with the award, I would have conferred on him a higher degree, a Phi Beta Kappa, doctor of law degree, if that had been possible, because he has proved himself to be a fine gentleman in looking after the interests of Senators, both Republicans and Democrats. I congratulate him, and I congratulate the Senate for having such a fine individual serve its interests.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana and of the Senator from Wisconsin. Bobby Baker is indeed a wonderful person and a true friend. As a matter of fact, he has extended his friendship even so far as to ask me to become a member of his legal fraternity, which I am very glad he did. I share many pleasant hours with him. I wish him much success, and the best of everything in the future.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to add my voice to the felicitations being extended to the secretary of the majority. Since I became a Member of the Senate 2½ years ago as a member of the then freshman class, I have found that Dr. Baker, his operations in the Senate, and his knowledgeability in the ways of legislation have been a tremendous source of learning for me. It seems only fitting that the official stamp of approval by an outstanding university of the country should be placed upon Dr. Baker's brow. It is a pleasure to be present today and to be given an opportunity to say these few words.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a very distinguished member of the staff of the U.S. Senate, Mr. Robert G. Baker, who on yesterday was honored by American University by the conferral upon him of the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

I have known Robert Baker ever since I came to the Senate. I have noticed the efficiency with which he labors. I have noticed the knowledgeable way in which he serves the Senate and the country. Of all the persons I could name, I could name no other who so richly deserves his honor.

May other institutions follow suit and lavish upon him richly deserved degrees, because when they do so, they pay tribute to the Senate as an institution, to its personnel, and to its part as an integral component in the greatest free Republic on the face of the earth.

Dr. Baker, I salute you.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. Baker was born and raised in Pickens, S.C. On the Sunday before last, I had the pleasure of being in Pickens, the home county of Mr. Baker, and joining in the dedication of the new post office there. Mr. Baker's father is the postmaster at Pickens. I had the pleasure of voting last year for the confirmation of his nomination as postmaster.

The people of Pickens County and of South Carolina are proud of the record of achievements of Robert Baker in the Senate. I personally extend to him my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have spoken concerning Robert Baker, secretary of the majority. Well do I remember when he was promoted to that position at a caucus of the Democratic Party. I am glad to say that I took some part in that action. I could foresee then a great future for Mr. Baker.

I was glad also to assist in securing favorable action on the nomination of Mr. Baker's father to be postmaster in Pickens. The RECORD will disclose that at the close of the last session of Congress his nomination was approved by the committee and was reported to the Senate, where it was unanimously confirmed.

Bob, we are glad to know that American University has seen fit to confer upon you an honorary degree of doctor of laws. You well deserve it.

We think you well deserve it. In the future may you not only live up to that expectation, but may you continue to grow in stature, if it is possible for anyone to grow any more than you have already grown; and may you accomplish great things. This is my wish, as one who comes from an adjoining county, for I was born in Anderson County, which is just across the line from the county of your birth. May you continue to go forward and progress and hold many other high honors in the years to come.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the labor which every attaché of the Senate renders is an indispensable part of the processes of the Republic, as all of us know them, although, unfortunately, the public generally has not been too well acquainted with that aspect of the operations of the Senate. We on this side of the aisle are proud of our Republican staff; and Senators on the majority side of the aisle may take equal pride in their staff.

Today, I am glad to join the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader of the Senate, in paying our respects to the secretary of the majority. I am glad to call Bobby Baker my friend. I am glad to salute him as one who is uniquely equipped in the science of American government and American politics. The American people owe much to persons like him. They owe a great debt for the responsible manner in which such public servants play their part in the operation of the machinery of the U.S. Senate.

I extend to Bobby congratulations for a well-deserved tribute, and I am sure I speak for all Senators on this side of the aisle when I express those sentiments on this occasion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish not only to associate myself with the well-deserved and well-stated remarks of the Senator from California, but also to have them printed in all capital letters, because Robert Baker is an invaluable aid to the U.S. Senate—a great public servant, a fine man, and a good gentleman. The American University exercised excellent judgment in paying him the well-deserved honor of an honorary degree.

I join my colleagues in saluting this gentleman, whom we have affectionately called Bobby, by now calling him, in more formal terms, Dr. Baker.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I associate myself with my colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. Robert Baker.

When I first came to the U.S. Senate, in 1959, he was one of the friends I found who helped me very much and explained to me how the Senate works. More important than that, if the time comes when I am asked where I stand in the estimation of my friends, I should like to be able to say that I stand high in the friendship of Dr. Robert Baker.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues who have paid tribute to the man we know affectionately as Bobby Baker. In view of the fact that other business must be transacted at this time, I shall make my remarks very brief.

I believe the honor he has received is very well deserved. It comes to one who, under the most strenuous circumstances in the Senate, has always been kind, considerate, and thoughtful, even to those of us on the minority side. So we congratulate you, Bobby, and we are happy for you.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Colorado in the statement he has just made.

As a rather new Member of this body, I always have found Dr. Baker very considerate of all on our side. One can go to Bobby and ask him anything which is reasonable. He always gives a well informed answer.

I express my personal tribute, and congratulate him on the high honor he has received.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleague [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators who have spoken in congratulating the one whom we know affectionately as Bobby Baker. He has served the other side superbly well; and we wish we had him on our side, although we do very well, indeed, with Mark Trice and Bill Brownrigg.

The Senate, which often is called a club, is a great place because of men such as Bobby Baker, who make life more bearable for all of us, and give what we in New York call "straight steers."

I, too, congratulate Bobby and his wife and his family for the very well deserved honor he has received from American University.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the other Senators who have spoken so ably of the secretary of the majority, Bobby Baker, and wish him well. I offer him my own congratulations.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I congratulate American University on having the good judgment to recognize the fine services Bobby Baker has rendered to the Senate and to the Nation, by conferring, as a memento of his services, the doctorate degree which was conferred upon him in so meritorious a fashion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

Today, words have been spoken very fitly in commendation of Bobby Baker.

I add my own congratulations to those of other Senators. I also wish to congratulate American University on its wisdom in bestowing this very high honor upon Bobby Baker.

As a student at American University and one who attends law school at night, I take special pride in knowing that the university has recognized Bobby Baker in this fashion.

Bobby Baker has been very helpful to me, as he has been to other Members of the Senate. As one of the newer Members of the Senate, I shall always be deeply indebted to him.

In the words of Alexander Pope, I say to Bobby Baker, "thou art my guide, philosopher, and friend."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in spite of the fact that the Senate is now to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHY HAVE NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS TURNED SO NEGATIVE AT GENEVA?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the other evening, in a clear and eloquent message to the American people which once again demonstrated his leadership and grasp of the world situation, President Kennedy presented a somber picture of the position of the United States in the world today.

In that talk the President said:

> The one area which afforded some immediate prospect of accord was Laos. Both sides endorsed the concept of a neutral and independent Laos, much in the manner of Burma or Cambodia.
>
> And of critical importance to the current conference on Laos in Geneva, both sides recognized the importance of an effective cease-fire. It is urgent that this be translated into new attitudes at Geneva, enabling the International Control Commission to do its duty, to make certain that a cease-fire is enforced and maintained.
>
> I am hopeful that progress can be made on this matter in the coming days at Geneva, so that it would greatly improve international atmosphere.

Two days later the morning paper said, however:

> Geneva, June 7.—The capture of the little Lao village of Padong by Communist-led rebels today threatened to break up the Geneva Conference on Laos.

Let us hope this action resulted from independent Communist Chinese pressures—and let us always be hopeful in general; but we know from the long record that these Communists are hard people to deal with.

In the talk Tuesday evening, President Kennedy also said:

> No such hope emerged, however, with respect to the other deadlocked Geneva conference seeking a treaty to ban nuclear tests.
>
> Mr. Khrushchev made it clear that there could not be a neutral administrator in his opinion because no one was truly neutral, that a Soviet veto would have to apply to acts of enforcement, that inspection was only a subterfuge for espionage in the absence of total disarmament, and that the present test-ban negotiations appeared futile.

It is to that question of nuclear tests cessation that I address myself this afternoon.

At a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last March 14, I asked the Honorable John McCloy, Adviser to the President on Disarmament, to send the committee answers to 20 questions submitted at that time, which questions were incident to the current nuclear test ban talks going on at Geneva.

These 20 questions have now been answered, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT CONCERNING 20 AREAS OF NEGOTIATION LISTED BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

During recent hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations Senator STUART SYMINGTON requested information concerning 20 specified areas of negotiation in the current Geneva talks on a nuclear test

ban treaty. This report is in response to his request.

The 20 items which he listed all relate to the control system contemplated for the detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests. This report sets forth the U.S. position with respect to each of these items.

The technical aspects of the control system proposed by the United States are based largely upon:

1. The report of the conference of experts from both sides which met in Geneva in 1958. This report describes detection and identification methods for underground, surface and atmospheric tests. It was accepted by both sides as the basis for negotiation, although subsequent research has led the United States to question some of its conclusions.

2. The report of technical working group II entitled "The Detection and Identification of Seismic Events." This group met in Geneva in 1959. The agreed portion of the report recommended certain improved seismological equipment for detecting and identifying underground tests. The U.S. experts at this conference also proposed additional seismic techniques as well as a research program to improve detection methods, but the Soviet experts did not agree to this portion of the report.

3. The report of technical working group I entitled "The Detection and Identification of High Altitude Nuclear Explosions." This group met in Geneva in 1959 and its report was accepted by both sides as the basis for negotiation.

Each of these reports will be referred to in discussing the technical aspects of the proposed treaty below. Additional research has been done in the United States since these reports were issued to support our position at Geneva.

1. TOTAL NUMBER NEEDED TO POLICE

The total number of people needed to police the inspection system will depend upon the number of control posts and other detection facilities and administrative offices which are utilized pursuant to the treaty.

The 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts recommended the establishment of 160–170 land-based control posts, and approximately 10 ship-based control posts. (Department of State, "Documents on Disarmament," 1945–1959 (cited hereafter as "Documents"), vol. II, p. 1108.) The 1958 Conference of Experts also concluded that aircraft should be used for air sampling. The 1959 technical working group I recommended the establishment of earth and solar satellites for detecting tests in outer space. (Documents, pp. 1432–1433.) It also proposed increased instrumentation for the control posts on the earth's surface.

Based on estimates of the 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts, as many as 5,400 scientists and other specialists might be required to man all the control posts including those on ships as well as on land. (Documents, op. cit., supra, p. 1108.) Additional personnel would be needed at these control posts to form an auxiliary service staff. Other specialists and administrative personnel would be needed for the satellite and aircraft operation, for the headquarters staff and regional offices of the Control Commission, and for onsite inspection teams. The total number required for the control system was not estimated by any of the conferences of experts.

Estimates of the number of scientists and other specialists to be located at the control posts of the Geneva system, and of the total number of personnel needed by the entire system, have been made for the Defense Department, but these estimates have not been the subject of negotiation with experts from the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. Neither the estimates of the 1958 Conference of Experts nor those of the Defense Department have been subjected to the budgetary and other review procedures which will be applied if a treaty is signed and appropriations for the operation of the control system are sought.

2. NUMBER IN EACH COUNTRY

The number of people in each country would depend in large measure upon the number of control posts set up in each country. Those countries in which the headquarters and regional offices were located would have an additional complement of control system personnel.

The 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts concluded that each control post might need about "30 persons with various qualifications and fields of specialization, and also some persons for auxiliary servicing staff." (Documents, op. cit., supra, p. 1108.) Higher estimates have been made for the Department of Defense, but, as indicated in response to item 1, they have not been subjected to final budgetary review.

The number of control posts within each country is in general governed by the spacing requirements established by the report of the 1958 conference of experts. (Documents, supra, p. 1108.) This report provides that the spacing between control posts in continental aseismic areas would be about 1,700 kilometers, and in seismic areas about 1,000 kilometers (ibid.). Pursuant to these spacings, the United Kingdom with U.S. approval, proposed on September 29, 1960, a draft article which contemplated establishing control posts in various countries as follows (art. 16, annex I):

U.S.S.R. (including 1 U.S.S.R. island)	21
United States (including U.S. islands)	17
United Kingdom (not including United Kingdom islands)	1
Oceanic Islands	53
Australia	7
Asia (non-U.S.S.R)	19
Europe (non-U.S.S.R.)	3
North America non-United States (and Greenland)	13
Africa	16
South America	16
Antarctica	4
Total	170

The U.S. delegation offered on March 21, 1961, to reduce the number of control posts to be located in the U.S.S.R. from 21 to 19 on the assumption that two additional posts would be located in areas bordering the Soviet, and that one less post would be located in the United States.

The United Kingdom-United States proposal of 21 control posts in the U.S.S.R was based in part on the principle that the original parties to the treaty should attempt to establish effective control within their territories as early as possible. Accordingly, the United States proposed that, where control posts might be located just outside the borders of the original parties, the posts should instead be placed within the territories of the original parties. This led to a few more posts in the United States and the U.S.S.R. than might be justified by geographic size and the spacing requirements alone. It is now proposed that the number of U.S.S.R. control posts be reduced to 19 without reducing the total number of posts available in the general area of the U.S.S.R.

3. NUMBER OF SHIPS—OCEANIC AREAS

The 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts concluded that oceanic control posts should be established on about 10 ships. (Documents, op. cit., supra, p. 1108.) During earlier negotiations, the U.S. delegation proposed a draft treaty article providing for 10 ship control posts. (U.S. draft annex 1, art. 16.) The U.S.S.R. has agreed to this position. (U.S.S.R. draft annex 1, art. 16.)

4. RELATIONSHIP OF MANNED TO UNMANNED STATIONS

No unmanned control posts were recommended by either of the two Geneva Conferences of Seismological Experts, and none has been proposed in treaty language tabled by the United States, the United Kingdom, or the U.S.S.R.

After further research indicated that the efficacy of the system proposed by the 1958 Conference of Experts to identify low-yield explosions was not as great as originally anticipated, a panel on seismic research headed by Dr. Lloyd Berkner of Associated Universities suggested that "the augmentation of the Geneva net with an auxiliary network of unmanned seismic stations offers the possibility of major improvement in the capability to discriminate between earthquakes and explosions." (Findings of U.S. Panel of Seismic Improvement, Mar. 16, 1959, documents, op. cit., supra, pp. 1367, 1370; see also Report of the U.S. Panel on Seismic Improvement, Mar 31, 1959, documents, op. cit., supra, pp. 1378, 1386.)

The Berkner panel's proposal has certain disadvantages. As Dr. Carl Romney of the Air Force Technical Applications Center testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"The disadvantages of this approach are the high cost of installation and operation—of the order of $100,000 initial cost per station and a somewhat lesser cost annually for operation, and a substantial part for communication and security—problems associated with the physical security of the station and of the integrity of the data, and perhaps the problem that this approach requires far greater access to foreign territories than do manned stations because of the greatly increased number of stations required—the most authoritative study, by the Berkner panel suggests that the stations should be spaced on the order of 100 miles apart. * * *" (See "Technical Aspects of Detection and Inspection Controls of a Nuclear Weapons Test Ban," hearings before subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 86th Cong., 2d sess. (cited hereafter as "Technical Aspects") p. 112 (1960).)

When further tests and research reduced our estimates as to the capability of the network of 180 manned stations proposed by the 1958 Conference of Experts, the United States proposed a phased treaty with a 4.75 seismic magnitude threshold. The purpose of this proposal was to match the treaty obligation to the reduced capability of the Geneva network, as explained in more detail under items 7 and 9 below. Because of the disadvantages of unmanned stations and Soviet unwillingness to depart from the report of the 1958 Conference of Experts, this seemed a more feasible approach than seeking unmanned control posts. (See Technical Aspects, op. cit., supra, p. 415.)

As indicated below under item 14, a research program to improve the capability of the Geneva network to detect low-yield explosions is underway and further research is planned if a threshold treaty is executed. Unmanned control posts may be proposed as the result of this research.

5. SHOULD HOST NATION HAVE DECISIVE VOICE IN LOCATION?

Under the present U.S. proposal, a host country can object to the site of a control post, but, if it does so, it must provide an alternative location which meets objective seismic and other requirements.

The 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts agreed to approximate spacing distances between control posts which would apply without regard to the desires of the host nation. Their report states:

"The spacing between control posts in continental aseismic areas would be about 1,700 kilometers, and in seismic areas about

1,000 kilometers." (Documents, pp. 1090, 1108.)

The treaty language proposed by the United States to govern location of control posts makes location depend in large measure on the spacing requirements and upon the needs of seismic and other detection instruments. This language is as follows: (U.S. draft annex I, art. 5.)

"A. The spacing between control posts shall be about 1,700 kilometers in continental aseismic areas, about 1,000 kilometers in continental seismic areas.

* * * * *

"C. Specific sites for control posts shall be selected in a manner to give the maximum overall capability to the system. The siting of individual control posts shall be determined primarily on the basis of the seismic requirement. However, in the event that two or more suitable seismic sites are found in the desired areas, a final selection of the location of control posts shall be made with due consideration of siting requirements of the other methods of detection set forth in article 2 of this annex."

If more than one site met the foregoing criteria for location in the judgment of the Control Commission, treaty language proposed by the United States would give the host nation a voice in selecting which of the eligible sites would be used. This language states that decisions concerning location will be made by the control commission "in agreement with the party on whose territory the element is to be located; if any location recommended by the Commission should be unacceptable to the party concerned, the party shall provide, without undue delay, an alternative location which in the judgment of the Commission meets the requirements of the system, in accordance with the provisions of this treaty and its annexes." (U.S. draft, art. 6, par. 5.) Thus, if more than one site in the general area where the post must be located to comply with spacing requirements meets the seismic and other detection requirements in the judgment of the Control Commission, the host country could choose which of the two or more sites it preferred.

6. NUMBER AND NATIONALITY OF STAFF IN CONTROL STATION

Estimates of the number of people required at each control station are set forth under item 2 above.

The current U.S. proposals on nationality are as follows:

Control post chief: The chief would be a national of a country other than that of the host country. If the host country is the U.S.S.R., the chief would be a United States or United Kingdom national. If the host country is the United States or United Kingdom, the chief of the control post would be a U.S.S.R. national. If the host country is associated with an original party (United Kingdom, United States or U.S.S.R.), the chief would be a national of a country other than such original party or one of its associates.

Scientific and technical staff of control post: In the case of control posts located on the territory of any of the original parties, the scientific and technical staff would be composed in equal proportion of nationals of the U.S.S.R., nationals of the United Kingdom or the United States, and nationals of other countries. In the case of control posts located on the territory of other parties, no more than one-third of this staff would be nationals of the host country. In either case, this staff would be so composed that the total number of nationals of the U.S.S.R. and its allies would be equal to the total number of the nationals of the United States, United Kingdom, and their allies at each control post.

Supporting staff of control post: The supporting staff would be composed wherever possible of host country nationals.

7. PROBLEMS OF DETECTION AND DISTINGUISHING FROM EARTHQUAKES

Treaty language offered by the United States provides for seismic techniques to detect those underground nuclear tests which would be prohibited by the treaty, i.e., those which produce a reading of 4.75 or greater on seismographs. It would deal with the problem of distinguishing these tests from earthquakes by providing for on-site inspections.

In the present state of the art, an underground nuclear test cannot be positively identified by seismic techniques alone. Such identification is possible only with on-site inspection.

Seismic techniques can be used first to detect all seismic events of magnitude 4.75 or greater. A great many of these events can then be identified as earthquakes by "first motion" and other seismic criteria. The remaining number can be identified either as earthquakes or as explosions only by on-site inspection.

An estimate of the capability of the control-post network proposed at Geneva was made by the Air Force Technical Application Center (AFTAC) in January 1960 based upon the criteria of the U.S. Delegation to Technical Working Group II in 1959. This estimate assumed that 21 control posts would be established within the U.S.S.R., 11 in the United States, 1 in the United Kingdom, and none in other countries, in the initial period of the treaty. It also assumed that these posts would be instrumented with the improvements agreed to by both sides at the Technical Working Group II Conference. The study showed that the control system could detect and identify as earthquakes (by "first motion" and other seismic criteria) all but about 70 seismic events of magnitude 4.75 or greater in the U.S.S.R., United States and United Kingdom each year. (Technical Aspects, op. cit., supra, p. 92). Seismic magnitude 4.75 is equivalent to an explosion of 19 kilotons in what is called Rainier coupling. If fewer than 21 control posts were established in the U.S.S.R. in the intial period, the number of unidentified events would probably increase unless posts were constructed in countries bordering on the U.S.S.R.

A later study made by the Rand Corp. on the same assumptions indicates that there would be about 53 seismic events per year in the Soviet Union remaining unidentified after the application of first motion and other seismic criteria. For the complete Geneva system of 180 control posts throughout the world, the Rand study estimated that the number of unidentified seismic events would be reduced to about 28.

These two studies show that there would be each year in the U.S.S.R. from about 53 to 70 events of magnitude 4.75 or greater which could not be positively identified as earthquakes with control posts located only in the territories of the three original parties. With control posts in additional countries, the number of unidentified events would be smaller. The seismic research program now going on is expected to reduce the number of unidentified events still further.

At meetings of the Geneva Conference early in 1960, the United States proposed a phased treaty which would prohibit only those nuclear tests of seismic magnitude 4.75 or greater. (GEN/DNT/PV. 170, pp. 3–9). A proposed annex to the U.S. draft treaty establishing criteria to identify particular events of 4.75 magnitude or greater as suspicious and therefore eligible for onsite inspection was submitted to the Geneva Conference on July 20, 1960. (Revised draft annex I of a draft treaty, GEN/DNT/22/Rev. 1, July 20, 1960, art. 8). The U.S.S.R. has agreed to language defining magnitude 4.75 and to identification criteria proposed by the United States. (See Agreed Language entitled, "Definition of Magnitude 4.75;" U.S.S.R. draft annex I). The U.S.S.R. has not agreed to application of the first-motion criterion, but this criterion could nevertheless be utilized by U.S. scientists in determining whether to select events in the U.S.S.R. for inspection under treaty language proposed by the United States.

8. SIGNIFICANCE OF STRENGTH OF VARIOUS SEISMIC SIGNALS

The strength of the seismic signal is in general indicative of the size of the explosion of earthquake which the signal detects. For example, the 4.75 seismic magnitude threshold described in response to item 8 is equivlent to an explosion of about 19 kilotons yield (Rainier coupling). The exception to this relationship created by muffling or decoupling is set forth in response to item 11 below. Background seismic noise levels at any particular seismograph station must also be taken into account. This is recognized by the criteria for the location of control posts in the U.S. draft treaty language set forth in response to item 5.

9. SIGNIFICANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF "ON-SITE" QUOTA INSPECTION

The purpose of onsite inspection is to identify an event which is unidentified by seismograph or other detection methods. The quota concept for onsite inspections was proposed in order to eliminate the impasse resulting from Soviet insistence upon a veto on all onsite inspections and Western insistence upon inspecting all suspicious events.

The American position that the quota of 20 should be established for the U.S.S.R. originated with Ambassador Wadsworth's speech at Geneva on February 11, 1960, when he said:

"My delegation is authorized to suggest the adoption of a threshold of magnitude 4.75 on the unified magnitude scale in common use by seismologists. Thus, depending on whether we are able to reach agreement on criteria, either all seismic events of magnitude greater than 4.75 located by the system would be eligible for inspection or, alternatively, only those events above such magnitude left unidentified after the application of the U.S. criteria would be eligible for inspection. In the former case, we would propse that 20 percent of all events located by the system would be subject to inspection; in the latter case we would propose that 30 percent of unidentified events be inspected. On the basis of the best estimates provided by U.S. scientists, and assuming the existence of control posts initially only on the territories of the three original parties, it appears that either formula applied to events of magnitude 4.75 or greater would result in about 20 inspections in the Soviet Union in the average year. At this point I should perhaps interpolate that our scientists believe that, roughly speaking, about 100 seismic events above a threshold of magnitude 4.75 are likely to occur each year in the area of the Soviet Union, and that about 70 of them are likely to remain unidentified by the original control net." (GEN/DNT/PV. 170, pp. 3–9.)

As indicated in response to item 7, there would be, in the present state of the art, 53–70 unidentified events over 4.75 remaining after application of U.S. seismic criteria at the control posts located in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. When control posts were located in additional countries, the number of unidentified events would of course be reduced.

An inspection of 20 out of the 53–70 is believed to provide an adequate deterrent to

illegal nuclear explosions producing a seismic signal over 4.75 magnitude. This reduction from 53–70 down to 20 is based in large part upon the fact that a trained seismologist can determine that some of these seismic events, although not positively identified as earthquakes, are not really suspicious. In part, the reduction from 53–70 down to 20 is based on the assumption that since a would-be violator does not know which suspicious seismic event of 4.75 magnitude or above may be inspected, every suspicious event need not be inspected to provide adequate deterence. Improvements resulting from seismic research would of course bring the number of unidentified events closer to 20, as would the installation of control posts in countries other than the original three. The American position concerning the quota of onsite inspections was the subject of considerable testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during March of 1961.

10. METHOD WHEREBY ON-SITE INSPECTIONS CAN BE CONDUCTED

Draft treaty language proposed by the United States provides that the Administrator of the control system shall immediately dispatch an inspection team to carry out an onsite inspection whenever an event eligible for onsite inspection has occurred in the territory of any of the original parties. He may do this provided that the United States or United Kingdom requests the inspection in the case of U.S.S.R. territory or that the U.S.S.R. requests the inspection in the case of United States or United Kingdom territory, and provided also that the applicable quota for inspections has not already been exhausted. (U.S. draft article entitled "On-Site Inspection for Seismic Events," par. 2.) In the case of eligible events on territory of a party other than an original party, the Control Commission would decide whether an inspection should be made, provided of course that the applicable quota had not been used up.

Testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by Richard M. Foose, Chief of the Department of Earth Sciences, Stanford Research Institute, outlines three steps to be followed in onsite inspections. (Technical Aspects, op. cit., supra, p. 282 et seq.) The first step—aerial reconnaissance—would be to select by observation and photography one or more areas of probably 1 to 5 square kilometers for further inspection. The second step would be to select, by further aerial reconnaissance and by ground inspection, sites within 500 feet of the epicenter of the event for drilling. It may be possible without drilling to establish with reasonable certainty that the event was simply an earthquake. If not, however, the third step would be to drill into the ground with the objective of penetrating the explosion site and collecting a radioactive sample.

The United States has proposed treaty provisions to govern the method for conducting onsite inspections. (Annex 1, art. 9.) These describe these methods as follows:

"C. Each inspection group shall, when dispatched, conduct any inspection directed by the Administrator in a prompt and efficient manner and shall be authorized to:

"1. Establish a local base of operations.

"2. Establish and maintain communications with its permanent base, the central inspection office, and, as required, other components of the system.

"3. Consult with local officials and individuals.

"4. Conduct low-altitude aerial inspection of the area eligible for inspection, utilizing such techniques as may be necessary for the purpose, including, but not limited to photographic, electromagnetic, magnetic, infrared, and radioactivity surveys.

"5. Conduct surface and subsurface inspection in the area eligible for inspection for all evidence which may in any way relate to the nature of the event, utilizing such techniques as may be necessary for the purpose, including drilling for radioactive samples for scientific analysis.

"6. Utilize such other means of investigation on site as would be likely to produce relevant data."

The U.S. draft provisions concerning the equipment which should be available to onsite inspection teams give further indication of the detection methods to be used. This equipment is to include the following (annex 1, art. 9, par. 1):

"1. Portable seismographs for recording aftershocks, geophysical equipment for seismic profiling, detection equipment for locating metallic articles, radiation detectors, equipment for collecting radioactive samples on the surface, drilling equipment for obtaining underground radioactive samples, portable laboratory equipment for field radiochemical analysis, and photographic equipment.

"2. Appropriate surface and air transport for rapid movement to an inspection area along routes prescribed by the host country.

"3. Appropriate aircraft for the conduct of low-altitude aerial reconnaissance of the inspection area for evidence of the nature of the event in question.

"4. Appropriate vessels for conduct of inspection of maritime events.

"5. Technically suitable and reliable communications equipment to establish and maintain contact with its permanent base of operations, the central inspection office, and, as required, other system components."

This draft treaty language continues to be the current U.S. proposal on the subject. The U.S.S.R. has neither agreed to these provisions nor offered comparable language of its own.

11. POSSIBILITY OF DECOUPLING, MUFFLING, LARGE CAVITIES, SALT DOME

When an explosion is detonated underground in a hole only large enough to accommodate the explosive, the explosion, known as a "tamped shot," exerts sufficient pressure to stress adjacent rock beyond its breaking point. This results in motion of the surrounding earth outward from the explosion and produces a signal upon seismographs which are within range.

Dr. Albert Latter of the Rand Corp. conceived of a method of muffling or decoupling an explosion by detonating it in a large underground hole. (See Technical Aspects, op. cit., supra, p. 124, et seq.) He theorized that the force of the explosion would be dispersed over the walls of the large hole and produce far less pressure at any point than it would in a small hole. By placing the hole deep underground, the countervailing pressure created by the overlying earth would be greatly increased. If the hole were large enough and far enough underground, the walls of the explosion chamber would not receive sufficient stress to rupture and the seismic signal would be substantially reduced.

This theory was developed after the 1958 Conference of Experts and was one of the reasons the U.S. delegation sought another meeting between American and Soviet experts. The meeting, referred to as Technical Working Group II, was held in 1959. The report of the American experts (to which the Soviet scientists did not agree) provides as follows (Documents, op. cit., supra, p. 1579):

"Rigorous theoretical calculations combined with measurements on the Rainer explosion show that the seismic signal produced by an explosion in a sufficiently large underground cavity in salt or hard rock will be reduced by a factor of 300 or more relative to the seismic signals from an explosion of the same yield under Rainer conditions. Calculations indicate that a cavity at a depth of about one kilometer with a volume of 7×10^4 cubic meters per kiloton should suffice.

"Cavities are known to exist in salt formations which would satisfy the volume and depth requirement for explosions of several kilotons. Engineering studies indicate that it is feasible to construct cavities which would satisfy the volume requirement for explosions at least as large as 70 kilotons. The total construction time for a cavity of this size in a salt dome is estimated to be from 2 to 4 years."

In 1960, the Atomic Energy Commission conducted tests with conventional explosives which proved the accuracy of Dr. Latter's theory. These tests indicated that an explosion in a suitable underground hole in a salt dome would probably appear on seismographs to have the yield of an explosion about 300 times smaller set off in a fully tamped hole in the Nevada rock where the Rainer shot which formed the basis for the 1958 Conference of Experts estimates was exploded. (Technical Aspects, op. cit. supra, pp. 136–137).

Statements before subcommittees of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy indicate that the only reasonably practicable way of creating a suitably large and deep underground hole is by dissolving the salt out of an underground salt dome. (Technical Aspects, op. cit. supra, pp. 138, 184, 426). Salt domes are reported to exist in a region of the Soviet Union of about the size of the Gulf coast area of the United States. Construction of a cavity suitable for decoupling an explosive of 30 kilotons yield has been estimated to cost from $2.5 to $11 million and to take from 16 to 48 months to complete. (Technical Aspects, op. cit. supra, pp. 146, 147, 131). Larger weapons would of course require larger holes. (Ibid.; see also Technical Problems and the Geneva Test Ban Negotiations Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 86th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 17–18 (1960). The major engineering effort necessary for even a 30 kiloton shot might well be detected by reconnaissance satellites or other intelligence. (Id. at p. 184.)

One of the reasons a treaty with a 4.75 threshold was proposed by the United States was because of the difficulty of detecting explosions in large underground holes. As indicated above, the treaty now under discussion would not prohibit any underground shot which did not produce seismic readings of 4.75 or above.

Such explosions would be banned for 3 years by the unilateral moratorium described under item 13 below. The possibility that the Soviets would go to the necessary effort to produce a salt dome explosion chamber during this 3-year period must be evaluated in the light of the time and expense necessary for construction, and the possibility of detecting the construction work through intelligence. Moreover, the areas in Russia where salt domes are known to exist are relatively aseismic. (Technical Aspects, supra, p. 185.) Any significant seismic event originating there (even a magnitude less than 4.75) would be suspect. Should the United States secure substantial evidence of a breach of the moratorium by the U.S.S.R., it would be in a position to make that information public and to announce its intention of withdrawing from the moratorium unless such tests ceased.

12. MEMBERSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL CONTROL SYSTEM AND SCOPE OF ITS POWER

The international control system organization would include (a) the Conference, (b) the Control Commission, and (c) the Administrator and his staff.

(a) The Conference would be composed of representatives of all parties to the treaty under an agreed article entitled "The Conference." It would be convened at the request of the Control Commission or of a majority of the parties to the treaty. The

agreed article provides that the Conference's power would include, among other things:

(i) election of States to serve on the Control Commission in accordance with provisions described below.

(ii) approval of the budget recommended by the Commission. (The U.S. Delegation proposed on March 21, 1961 that unanimous approval of the total budget be required but that majority approval be sufficient for specific items in the budget.)

(iii) decision of any matter specifically referred to it by the Control Commission by majority vote unless otherwise provided in the treaty.

(iv) approval of amendments to the treaty by a two-thirds vote, with the concurrence of all original parties.

(b) The U.S. delegation proposed on March 21, 1961, that the Control Commission have a 4-4-3 membership: four from Western States; four from Soviet bloc States; and three from neutral countries. This proposal was made on the condition that agreement be reached on an effective control system which, in its day-to-day activities, operated largely independently of the Commission.

Under the U.S. draft of article 6, the Control Commission would have the following powers, among others:

(a) to decide upon the location of control posts and other elements of the control system in agreement with the party on whose territory the element is to be located (if the party failed to agree to a Commission recommendation, it would have to provide another site suitable to the Commission);

(b) to lay down flight routes for special aircraft sampling missions in agreement with the party concerned (if the party failed to agree to a Commission recommendation, it would have to provide another route suitable to the Commission);

(c) to appoint an Administrator with the concurrence of all the original parties on the Commission;

(d) to adopt rules and standards for the guidance of the Administrator and the staff;

(e) to maintain general supervision over the control system; and

(f) to insure that a research and development program is carried out for the purpose of improving the control system.

c. The Administrator, under U.K. Draft Article 9 which the United States supports, would be the chief executive officer and head of the staff of the control system. He would be responsible to the Commission for the installation and operation of the control system. He would appoint the staff pursuant to the various nationality requirements set forth in article 9 and would supervise them in the performance of the various functions necessary to make the control system work. One of his most important duties would be to dispatch teams to make onsite inspections under the circumstances set forth above under item 10.

13. QUESTION OF REVIEWING MORATORIUM ON TESTS BELOW AGREED THRESHOLD

In their joint declaration of March 29, 1960, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan agreed that as soon as a treaty prohibiting nuclear tests above 4.75 seismic magnitude was signed "and arrangements made for a coordinated research program for the purpose of progressively improving control methods for events below a seismic magnitude of 4.75, they will be ready to institute a voluntary moratorium of agreed duration on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold, to be accomplished by unilateral declaration of each of the three powers."

At the September 1960 sessions of the Geneva Conferences, the United States proposed that this moratorium should run for approximately 2 years and 3 months, the period necessary for the research program plus a review of that program. (PV. 247, pp. 8-10.) On March 21, 1961, the U.S. Delegation offered to extend the moratorium to 3 years from the date the treaty is signed because the research program as modified will extend more than the 2-year period originally contemplated.

At the end of the moratorium, a reappraisal of the U.S. position based on the results of the research will be made. Ambassador Dean, at the March 21, 1961, meeting, proposed that the last few months of the moratorium be utilized for consultations to determine whether the 4.75 magnitude threshold should be maintained, changed or eliminated. The U.S. position is that the 4.75 threshold should be modified to the full extent of the ability to inspect and control underground nuclear explosions disclosed by the research program.

14. PROCEDURES FOR CARRYING ON JOINT TESTS AIMED AT SEISMIC IMPROVEMENTS

The Eisenhower-Macmillan declaration of March 29, 1960, proposed "a coordinated research program for the purpose of progressively improving control methods for events below seismic magnitude of 4.75."

This program would be coordinated in the sense that the plans for research, the experiments themselves, and the results would be made available to the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. It would not be joint in the sense that the United Kingdom or the U.S.S.R. would have a veto over any part of the program. Nor would it be joint in the sense that research would be conducted in all three countries. Present indications are that the Soviets would probably not desire to conduct any experiments in the U.S.S.R. If they did, however, such experiments would be subject to the same procedures as those in the United States.

Part of the research program would consist of underground detonations of out-of-date nuclear devices. The American delegation on March 21 and 22, 1961, offered the U.S.S.R. permission to inspect these devices if a treaty and moratorium are agreed to, subject, of course, to congressional authorization. In return, the Soviet representative was asked to confirm his indication at an earlier meeting that, if the U.S.S.R. decided to detonate a nuclear device pursuant to a seismic research program, the United States would be given the opportunity to inspect that device. Based on a thorough study, we have concluded that inspection of an out-of-date U.S. device by the U.S.S.R. would not prejudice the security of the United States or increase the knowledge of the U.S.S.R. in any significant way.

The United States has already begun Project VELA, a research program aimed, among other things, at improving seismological techniques sufficiently to detect and identify small underground tests. (See White House statement of May 7, 1960, to be published in Documents on Disarmament, 1960.) Portions of this program have been proceeding without agreement on the treaty. These portions have been described to U.S.S.R. scientists.

15. SHOULD EFFECTIVE DATE OF TREATY BE BEFORE NETWORK COMPLETED?

The agreed treaty article entitled "Signature, Ratification, Acceptance, and Entry Into Force," provides that the treaty will enter into force upon ratification. The U.S. draft of annex I requires that the first phase of the treaty begin within 3 months of its date of entry into force and end within 2 years of that date (art. 14.) During this first phase, 10 control posts would be constructed in territory controlled by the U.S.S.R. under proposals made by the United States.

At the March 21, 1961, Geneva meeting, Ambassador Dean took the position that onsite inspections should begin as soon as there were enough control posts in the control system to produce seismic signals satisfying the criteria set forth in treaty drafts. He stated that this would be toward the conclusion of the 2-year period, but in no event later than the end of that period.

During the period before control stations were put into operation, the United States would continue to rely upon all its presently available means for detecting nuclear explosions. Our capability to detect nuclear tests in other countries would be improved as soon as control posts in the Geneva control system come into operation.

If the U.S.S.R. should prove uncooperative and delay the establishment of control posts in violation of the terms of the treaty, the United States could legally withdraw from the treaty pursuant to the agreed article entitled "Duration," discussed in response to item 20. The threat of this sanction is expected to be at least as effective in securing the installation of control posts on schedule as postponing the effective date of the treaty until the control post network is complete. No nation with any sensitivity to world opinion would want to be in the position of justifying, by its own dilatory tactics, the withdrawal of a nuclear power from the treaty.

16. RELIABILITY OF VARIOUS METHODS OF DETECTING OUTER SPACE TESTS

Numerous methods of detecting explosions in outer space were agreed to by technical working group I at the Geneva Conference on July 10, 1959. (Documents, op. cit., supra, pp. 1427-1434.) These methods would use detection instruments installed at the control posts and in a system of earth and solar satellites.

Ten different methods were found by technical working group I to be "technically feasible" for the detection of tests of various sizes and at various altitudes. (Ibid.) The earth satellite system, the report stated: "is capable of detecting nuclear explosions at altitudes above the altitude at which radiation could escape from the atmosphere (i.e. 30 kilometers for gamma rays and neutrons and 75-100 kilometers for soft thermal X-rays) and also nuclear explosions in cosmic space up to distances in accordance with recording capabilities of detectors of radiation (in some cases 300,000 kilometers but in one case 'a few hundred million kilometers')." (Id. at p. 1429.)

The present consensus of scientific opinion appears to be that the several land-based and earth-satellite-based techniques proposed by Technical Working Group I together offer good probability of detecting most nuclear explosions at least as far out in space as the moon, and good probability of detecting large nuclear explosions out to the sun. Beyond the moon and out to approximately 200 million miles (about twice the distance to the sun), the solar-satellite-based, X-ray technique would afford some probability of detecting even low-yield tests. However, a metallic shield placed around the nuclear device could theoretically reduce the effectiveness of the X-ray detection technique substantially.

While considerable study of outer space detection techniques has been made, much remains to be done. The lack of complete knowledge means that we cannot be certain of detecting an outer space test, but neither can a would-be violator be certain that he could escape detection even with shielding. Without considerable actual experience which no country is believed to possess, no potential violator would know whether a particular outer space testing technique or method of shielding would perform without malfunction. Moreover, scientists have estimated that an outer space evasion attempt would increase 3 to 10 times the already high cost of a test, double the time required to secure results from a test, and reduce significantly the useful information which could be secured from the test. Finally, considerable assistance in detecting outer

space tests would be provided by our existing methods for monitoring missile and satellite flights.

17. POSSIBILITY OF SHIELDING OUTER SPACE TESTS BEHIND THE MOON

The earth satellites referred to in response to item 16 would probably not detect nuclear tests carried out in an area behind the moon. (Documents, op. cit. supra, pp. 1427, 1430.) There is, however, doubt whether any nation possesses the capability to carry out such a test at the present time. Moreover, one of the purposes of the proposed solar satellites is to detect such a test. The July 10, 1959, report of technical working group I states:

"The systems of earth satellites * * * cannot detect nuclear explosions carried out in certain regions of controlled space, namely, behind the moon or the sun away from the earth. Unshielded nuclear explosions in these regions can, however, be detected by the apparatus for X-ray detection * * * when installed in a system of four satellites circling the sun in appropriate orbits, provided data from these satellites are regularly received on earth." (Documents, pp. 1427, 1430.)

On March 21, 1961, the American delegation proposed a high-altitude detection system which would be based largely on the report of technical working group I and would include solar satellites.

18. PROBLEM OF FIXING RESPONSIBILITY FOR TESTS IN REMOTE OCEAN AREAS

The detection and identification system proposed by the United States in its draft annex I is designed to detect tests in remote ocean areas, but it might conceivably be unable to fix responsibility for them. The likelihood that such tests could continue without detection of the guilty party must, however, be weighed in light of the ease of inspection of remote ocean areas by aircraft and ships. Treaty language proposed by the United States requires prompt dispatch of planes or ships to sample water at the site of any suspected nuclear explosion after it is located by hydroacoustic signals received at control posts. (Annex I, art. 7.) Moreover, daily routine air sampling flights would be conducted "in the center of remote ocean areas such as the Central Pacific, the Indian Ocean west of Australia, and the North Atlantic Ocean." (Annex I, art. 7, par. A.)

Assume that a nuclear explosion was located in a remote ocean area but that responsibility could not be fixed for it. Assume also that all known nuclear powers were parties to the treaty. Under these circumstances, it would probably be feasible both legally and politically for the United States to withdraw from the treaty on grounds that a violation had occurred, unless the location of the violation or other facts placed suspicion upon the United States for the test.

The agreed article entitled "Duration" permits withdrawal when the provisions of the treaty "are not being fulfilled and observed." It does not require identification of the violator. Under the case assumed above, there has been an apparent violation of the treaty. Unless the United States itself is the violator, the treaty language would appear to justify withdrawal.

19. QUESTION OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS FOR PEACETIME PURPOSES—MOVING EARTH

There is agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. that nuclear explosions should be permitted for peaceful purposes such as moving earth. (See United States and U.S.S.R. draft articles entitled "Detonations for Peaceful Purposes.") There is also agreement that it is necessary to provide safeguards so that such explosions cannot be used for the clandestine development of nuclear weapons. (Ibid.)

The so-called black-box proposal made by the United States some time ago provided that each of the original parties to the treaty would be permitted to inspect any nuclear device to be used for peaceful purposes "unless the device was set aside on or before the date the treaty entered into force in a special depository established by and maintained under the custody of the depositing party." When the black-box proposal was first made, tests had just been suspended. It was therefore assumed that any device placed in the box would be a fully tested device. Thus, the subsequent "peaceful purposes" explosion would probably not give the maker of the device useful military information.

The Soviets say that they have suspended tests for more than 2 years. Although we do not know that this is the case, it still may be possible that the U.S.S.R. has developed untested devices with military potential which it could test using the black-box procedure. The U.S. delegation has therefore proposed that any device to be used by a party for peaceful purposes be available for inspection by other parties. This position is consistent with the longstanding U.S. position that inspection is essential to effective control of nuclear weapons. The position may, however, result in some future limitation upon the kinds of devices which can be used for peaceful purposes.

The U.S. delegation has also proposed that the control commission be authorized, with the concurring votes of the original parties, to provide for any other system of safeguards to insure that nuclear detonations for peaceful purposes are carried out in accordance with the objectives of the treaty.

20. POLITICAL FEASIBILITY OF EXTENDING THE CONTROL SYSTEM TO FRANCE, CHINA, AND OTHER WOULD-BE NUCLEAR POWERS NOT PARTY TO NEGOTIATIONS

During the 1960 Geneva test ban negotiations, the United States proposed treaty language providing that the Control Commission would invite states to become parties to the treaty. The invitation is to be extended to a state when the control commission finds: (i) its "adherence to the treaty is essential in order to achieve the fundamental treaty purpose of a permanent discontinuance of nuclear weapons test explosions on a world-wide basis," or (ii) "that elements of control are required to be installed in territory under the jurisdiction or control of that state." (U.S. draft parties article.)

This treaty language provides the means by which additional states such as France and Communist China would become parties to the treaty at the appropriate time.

The spacing requirements between control posts in the 1958 report of the conference of experts are such that control posts would have to be established on the territory of many States other than original parties. Both sides have agreed to these spacing requirements and both have offered treaty drafts contemplating the location of control posts in territories of Europe and Asia which are not under the control of the United Kingdom or the U.S.S.R. (See United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. drafts of annex I, art. 16.)

The need to establish control posts, as well as a control commission finding that adherence of a particular state was the essential to achieve the fundamental treaty purpose, would probably result in several Asian and European states being invited to membership. If such states chose to frustrate the purposes of the treaty by refusing an invitation, or by refusing to allow elements of the control system to be established on their territory, all other parties would have the option of resorting to the unilateral right of withdrawal contained in the agreed duration article of the treaty. This article reserves to each party the right to withdraw if the treaty provisions, "including those providing for timely installation and effective operation of the control system, are not being fulfilled and observed."

The political feasibility of one state or another joining the treaty is a question which can only be answered in light of the political climate prevailing at the time that that state is invited to become a party. However, if the treaty were signed, states invited to become parties might face a difficult political task in remaining outside the treaty. These states would be confronted by a large and hostile measure of world public opinion, if, by not joining it, they were to cause the collapse of the agreement. The consequences of refusing to cooperate in a major first step toward controlled disarmament would force upon any state serious consideration of the consequences of its refusal. Moreover, the normal, full range of diplomatic and political measures would be open to the United States and to all other parties to the treaty to encourage the widest participation in the treaty.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. McCloy's covering letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is of special interest, because in that letter he says:

In view of the Soviets' insistence upon a three-man administrative directorate, and their unwillingness to move forward from their previous positions, the enclosed report may be somewhat academic at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Mr. McCloy to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1961.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: During recent hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator STUART SYMINGTON listed 20 areas of negotiations in the current nuclear test ban talks in Geneva. He requested information concerning our position with respect to each of these areas.

The enclosed report is a response to this request. In view of the Soviets' insistence upon a three-man administrative directorate, and their unwillingness to move forward from their previous positions, the enclosed report may be somewhat academic at the present time. We thought, however, that you, Senator SYMINGTON, and the remainder of the committee would appreciate having the information contained in the report.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
Adviser to the President on Disarmament.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, part of the answer to question No. 1 states:

Estimates of the number of scientists and other specialists to be located at the control posts of the Geneva system, and of the total number of personnel needed by the entire system, have been made for the Defense Department, but these estimates have not been the subject of negotiations with experts from the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R.

Thereupon I requested information from the Department of Defense as to their estimate of the total number of people required to staff the Geneva system for detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter from the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, Mr. Norman Paul, to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested by your committee's staff on May 17, I am forwarding herewith information on the total number of people estimated as required to staff the "Geneva system" for detection and identification of nuclear weapon tests.

It should be pointed out that the indicated numbers of personnel are the best estimates available at this time from our technical advisers, and that more precise requirements can be developed only after there has been complete agreement on the details of the detection and identification system which might be installed and placed in operation.

It is a pleasure to have been of service to you.

Sincerely,

NORMAN S. PAUL,
Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the report in question received from the Department of Defense, and divided into the following sections, Introduction, Summary of Manpower Requirements for the Proposed Geneva Control System, Total Manpower Requirements, Headquarters Personnel Summary, Manpower Requirements for a Regional Office, Manpower Requirements for One Land Control Post, and Manpower Requirements for 170 Control Posts, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes an AFTAC study of the manpower requirements for the Geneva Control System agreed to by the conference of experts in 1958, and the techniques for detection of high altitude explosions by equipment at control posts discussed at technical working group 1. The study was completed on October 23, 1959.

Since this study was made, a great deal of further thought has been given to the techniques which might be useful in control posts for high altitude detection. Depending on which of these techniques might ultimately be included in the Geneva Control System and upon the outcome of the negotiations at Geneva, it is reasonable to expect that substantial alterations in manpower requirements might occur. The VELA research and development program in the Department of Defense will certainly reveal improvements that are likely to require additional manpower to implement in the control system.

It should be realized therefore that the figures in the attached report may be low by 25 to 35 percent. This percentage increase in the personnel required will probably apply uniformly to the three categories of personnel in the attached breakdown.

Estimates for onsite inspection have not included any estimate for heavy drilling operations which might be required in an unknown number of cases. A great deal more detailed study of the onsite inspection problem will be required before accurate estimates of manpower can be made. The figures on onsite inspection should therefore be viewed as probably a very minimum effort required by the first phase of a preliminary survey and do not cover the requirement which might develop if exhaustive onsite inspection is required.

SUMMARY OF MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED GENEVA CONTROL SYSTEM

Description of the control system

1. Briefly, the proposed international detection system will be composed of a system headquarters, 10 regional offices, 170 land control posts, 10 ship control posts, and 6 aerial control posts.

(a) Headquarters: Besides controlling the entire system, the headquarters will contain an analysis and research center and a central radiochemical laboratory.

(b) Regional offices: These offices will have the responsibility for administrative supervision and logistics support of the control posts. Operational control of the control posts will be retained at the system headquarters.

(c) Control posts: These stations located suitably throughout the world will collect data by scientific means on a 24-hour basis, communicating such data directly to the analysis center and central laboratory.

(d) Inspection groups: These groups will be mobile, organized, and equipped to perform the onsite inspection function when so directed by the system headquarters.

2. Methods to be used by the proposed system: Based on the Geneva Experts Report, the system for the detection and identification of nuclear explosions will use the following basic techniques:

(a) Seismic.

(b) Acoustic (including hydroacoustic).

(c) Electromagnetic (radio signal recording).

(d) Surface collection and analysis of radioactive debris.

(e) Airborne collection of radioactive debris and radiochemical analysis.

(f) The high altitude detection techniques which have been recommended by technical working group I at Geneva. These techniques include:

(1) Multiple channel optical detectors, suitable for observing direct visible light at each control post.

(2) Optical equipment suitable for observing fluorescence in the upper atmosphere at each control post.

(3) Equipment suitable for measuring the absorption of cosmic radio noise in the ionosphere at each control post.

(4) Equipment suitable for recording radio signals (electromagnetic radiations) at each control post. (Same as par. 2c.)

(5) Equipment for the detection of nuclear explosions at high altitude by the method of backscatter radar.

Note: Although the inclusion of this technique was recommended by the Western powers during technical working group I, the Soviets for various reasons were not in accord with the use of this technique for detection of high altitude nuclear explosions.

3. Control posts.

(a) This system will include a total of 180 control posts situated as follows:

(1) 110 on continents.

(2) 20 on large oceanic islands.

(3) 40 on small oceanic islands.

(4) 10 on ocean vessels.

(b) Continental and island control posts: These posts will be equipped with apparatus for detecting nuclear explosions by use of the seismic, acoustic, electromagnetic, visible light, atmospheric fluorescence, cosmic noise, and surface collection of radioactive debris techniques. Certain control posts (40) located near the shores of oceans will be equipped to detect underwater explosions by use of the hydroacoustic technique.

(c) Ship control posts: These stations employ the hydroacoustic and surface collection and analysis of radioactive debris methods.

(d) Control post spacing:

(1) Aseismic, 1,700 kilometers.

(2) Seismic areas, 1,000 kilometers.

(3) Ocean areas, 2,000 to 3,500 kilometers.

(e) Control posts equipment and manning:

(1) Apparatus installed at control posts should be uniform throughout the network and should satisfy the basic technical requirements specified in the Geneva Experts Conference and in the report of technical working group I.

(2) The operation of each land control post will require 43–61 technical personnel of varying qualifications. There will be an additional requirement for 10–44 personnel for supporting activities. Variation in manpower requirements is dependent on the geographical location of land control posts.

4. Aerial sampling posts: The aerial sampling requirement for the control system can be accomplished on a basis of special flights alerted by the geophysical system. The purpose of the aerial filtering flights would be to collect samples for identification rather than detection. This system would require about 54 aircraft operating out of 6 bases. A radiochemical laboratory will be required at each aerial sampling post.

5. Data analysis and research center: This center will include a central radiochemical laboratory where final confirming analyses are made. Analysis also will be performed on all geophysical data received from all components of the system.

6. Inspection system: Inspection groups will be used to investigate sites of suspected nuclear explosions. These groups shall be so dispersed among the regional offices and land control posts as to facilitate prompt access to and subsistence near the site of any unidentified continental or maritime event. These groups will collect all possible evidence to determine the nature of a geophysical disturbance. Only the Administrator of the system will have the authority to order an inspection. The report covers only phase I of the onsite inspection operation assuming 3 months for each preliminary inspection and 200 inspections per year worldwide. On this basis, 50 inspection teams will be required.

7. Communications: The communication resources included in this summary required for the worldwide coverage is a radio teletype system using landlines and point-to-point radio. The system consists of a tributary station at each activity plus 30 relay stations. The tributary stations vary in strength from a few men at contiguous stations to 141 men at the system headquarters. Relay stations will be collocated with other activities wherever possible.

8. Manpower: Manpower requirements for the entire system total 22,049. Some of these manpower requirements can be reduced as existing services such as communications are brought into the system. A summary of manning requirements is attached as appendix A.

APPENDIX A

This appendix provides an estimate of the manpower requirements for the international control system. These estimates are based on an organizational concept attached hereto for the headquarters of the detection and identification system, for the regional offices, and for the control posts. The total estimated manpower requirement for the complete system is 22,049. Tables 1, 2, and 3 of this appendix provide the detailed manpower requirements for each of the system elements. The manning (tables 4 and 5) requirements for each of these elements is further broken down into professional, technician, and support requirements.

(Charts not printed in RECORD.)

TABLE 1.—*Total manpower requirements*

	Total	Professional	Technician	Support		Total	Professional	Technician	Support
Headquarters	1,727	713	509	505	Communication relay	1,830	30	1,260	540
Regional offices	1,130	420	460	250	Onsite inspection, 50 teams	650	350	250	50
Aerial control posts	786	96	168	522					
Land control posts	14,576	3,200	8,112	3,264	Total	22,049	4,849	11,069	6,131
Ship control posts	1,350	40	310	1,000					

TABLE 2.—*Headquarters personnel summary*

	Total personnel	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support		Total personnel	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support
Office of Administrator	6	3		3	Director of Inspection	10	4		6
Director of Administration	6	3		3	Director of Technical Operations	6	3		3
Administrative	68	10		58	Systems Operations Center	55	34	5	16
Personnel Division	106	35		71	Data Analysis and Research Center	1,238	557	368	313
Materiel Division	50	33		17	Communications	141	3	136	2
Comptroller	28	20		8					
Programing Division	13	8		5	Total	1,440	597	509	334
Total	271	109		162	Total, headquarters personnel	1,727	713	509	505

TABLE 3.—*Manpower requirements for a regional office*

	Total	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support		Total	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support
Administrator	1	1			Comptroller	5	4		1
Administrative Division	6	2		4	Communications center	45		45	
Materiel Division	34	21		13					
Personnel Division	6	3		3	Total personnel	113	42	46	25
Technical Operations Division	14	10	1	3	10 regional offices	1,130	420	460	250
Government liaison	2	1		1					

TABLE 4.—*Manpower requirements for 1 land control post*

	Total	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support		Total	Professional	Technician	Clerical and support
Basic technical personnel:					Communications additives:				
Administration	2	2			Isolated relay additives	8	1	7	
Supervisors	6	6			Isolated nonrelay additives	18	2	16	
Operators	29	5	24		Contiguous relay	1		1	
Maintenance	6		6		Contiguous nonrelay	5	1	4	
					Backscatter additive	12	1	11	
Total	43	13	30		Weather detachments	6	1	5	
Support activities:					Hydroacoustic	6	1	5	
Isolated posts	26	4		22					
Contiguous posts	9	1		8					

TABLE 5.—*Manpower requirements for 170 control posts*

	Total	Professional	Technician	Support		Total	Professional	Technician	Support
Basic technical personnel: 170 posts	7,310	2,210	5,100		Communications—Continued				
Support:					28 contiguous nonrelay posts	140	28	112	
136 isolated posts	3,536	544		2,992	Backscatter radar: 25 posts	300	25	275	
34 contiguous posts	306	34		272	Weather detachments: 95 posts	570	95	475	
Communications:					Hydroacoustic: 40 posts	240	20	220	
28 isolated relay posts	224	28	196						
108 isolated nonrelay posts	1,944	216	1,728		Total	14,576	3,200	8,112	3,264
6 contiguous relay posts	6		6						

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there are many questions involved in this effort to reach agreement, including the number of trained people required, number of ships required for the oceanic areas, the voice of the host nation in location, the problem of earthquake detection, membership of the international control system, detection in outer space, nuclear explosions for peacetime purposes, and so forth.

Perhaps the two problems that interest me the most, however, are those with respect to decoupling, and the one contained in the answer to the question "Political feasibility of extending the control system to France, China, and other would-be nuclear powers not party to negotiations."

In answer 11 Senators will note that this memorandum states:

Rigorous theoretical calculations combined with measurements on the Rainier explosion show that the seismic signal produced by an explosion in a sufficiently large underground cavity in salt or hard rock will be reduced by a factor of 300 or more relative to the seismic signals from an explosion of the same yield under Rainier conditions.

When one considers that originally—that is, before decoupling—it was felt any underground explosion above 5 kilotons could be detected, and when the report continues that the "decoupling of an explosive of 30 kilotons yield has been estimated to cost from $2.5 to $11 million and to take from 16 to 48 months to complete," the seriousness of this problem from the standpoint of reality and practicality is all too clear.

The answer to question 20, "Political feasibility of extending the control system to France, China, and other would-

be nuclear powers not party to negotiations," states:

This treaty language provides the means by which additional states such as France and Communist China would become parties to the treaty at the appropriate time.

I do not worry about France, but I do worry about the relationship of Communist China to all these planned test cessation agreements.

The last paragraph states that if a country remained outside the treaty it "would be confronted by a large and hostile measure of world public opinion, if, by not joining it, they were to cause the collapse of the agreement."

One cannot help but wonder how much this type and character of opprobrium in countries of the free world would influence the Communist Chinese, especially if they were acting—as well they might—in secret agreement with Soviet Russia.

The Soviet Communists must be becoming increasingly apprehensive about the growth of the so-called nuclear club. Also they must be viewing the very rapid growth in the industrial complex of Red China with increasing apprehension.

Nevertheless, they are showing an increasing reluctance at Geneva to get down to business with respect to any meaningful nuclear test cessation agreement.

To me it does not seem possible that this is due entirely to recent successes they may have had on the diplomatic and paramilitary fronts, because such successes do not lessen the growing danger to them of N-club growth and Communist China.

What is the real reason in the back of their minds?

For 3 years come next October, the United States, on a voluntary unilateral basis, has stopped that testing necessary to further development of the nuclear art.

In doing so we recognize there is grave danger involved with respect to our national security.

But those who favor continuance of test cessation answer that by saying the danger of world opprobrium, if we resume testing, would be even greater.

Perhaps that is true.

Would it not be ironical, however, to find out on some unfortunate day that exactly the reverse were true; namely, that although the Communists did recognize the importance to them of the two above growing dangers, they had decided not to come to any test cessation agreement because of the tremendous unilateral advantage we had passed over to them voluntarily. This we had done by refusing to test for a long period of time, and thereby had made it possible for them to, in turn, make so much unilateral progress in the development of a new nuclear weapon that they had established supremacy in the world.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, world authority on Soviet Russia, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17 last, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE SEEN AS A MULTILATERAL DIALOG

Senator SYMINGTON. You mentioned utilization of military power as a way to blackmail, and you define the difference between the Chinese and the Russian position.

As I understand it, the Chinese say: "We should push ahead because of military strength. Our premise is that the West will not react"; but the Russians say: "We should not because the West might react."

Do you see any possible change?

In other words, will the growth in Chinese development tend to put them over more toward the Russian position, or will the Russian position, possibly as a result of a shift in political power, go more toward the Chinese situation; or, in your opinion, will they both stay in their status quo, as you have described it so well; in which case any change in the future would depend more on what we did than what they did?

I hope the question is not too involved, and that you see what I am getting at.

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Yes.

I would say that the last point you made is a very important one: The Sino-Soviet dialog is not a bilateral but multilateral dialog.

We are participating in it through our responses. And our response in the future to a Soviet ambiguous challenge, if it is weak, and if the Soviets continue with their successes, then we may anticipate that the Chinese will shift over to the Soviet position on the ground that nothing succeeds like success and support the Soviet position.

If, on the other hand, we respond in such a way that Soviet ambiguous challenges are contained and repelled, then the dilemma between the Soviets and the Chinese will become acute.

The Chinese would presumably then say: "The time has now come for the testing of our propositions," and much will depend on how strongly the Soviets can reject this.

SOVIET ANTICIPATION OF UNAMBIGUOUS MILITARY SUPREMACY

I would suspect that Soviet sophistication on the subject of thermonuclear war and their understanding of our strength is such that they would be unwilling to adopt the Chinese position on the grounds that this may be mutually suicidal.

Furthermore, they may well anticipate that in the foreseeable future they will gain tremendous military supremacy over us and, therefore, can afford to wait. I am very much impressed by a statement which Khrushchev made about a year ago, which you no doubt recall, in a speech of January 14, 1960, when he mentioned in one sentence that the Soviet Union was on the verge of developing a tremendous weapon, which would give them unlimited military superiority.

Now, one might say they were bluffing, but if they were bluffing, he would have repeated that statement again and again in order to make the world aware of it. For, after all, a bluff consists in establishing credibility with the object. He has never repeated that statement again, and for this reason I am inclined to attach considerable significance to it.

And I would feel that the Soviets probably calculate that in the foreseeable future they will attain unambiguous military supremacy over us, unambiguous in the sense that we will perceive it.

Senator SYMINGTON. Unambiguous?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Unambiguous in the sense that we will perceive it, and that having perceived it, we will be forced to adjust to it. And, more important, perhaps, that the rest of the world will perceive it and will have to adjust to it.

Senator SYMINGTON. If they accomplished something like that, it could be a defensive weapon as much as an offensive weapon. If they came up with something in the way of absolute missile defense, comparable to what we hope ultimately to have in, say, Nike-Zeus, then——

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Right.

Senator SYMINGTON (continuing). Then would they shift, in your opinion, more toward the Chinese position, or would they believe that as a result of the attainment of this new weapon they could continue successfully to blackmail us in diplomatic negotiations?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Once they had relative invulnerability vis-a-vis us, and at the same time we would still be vulnerable to them, this would be not a defensive advantage alone, but also an offensive advantage, and one that we would necessarily perceive.

Then they would have an option of either shifting to the Chinese policy of testing us in local wars and perhaps letting these wars develop into total war, since they would no longer need to fear it, or perhaps it would be sufficient for us to appreciate this fact and yield, and I am sure this is what they would first try.

The reason they have not been doing this is that I think they still appreciate our strength, at least to the point of not being willing at this point to endure the punishment which a war would bring to them even though they may feel they would win it.

So if they should achieve such a military supremacy, the difference between them and the Chinese will be necessarily narrowed, since the Soviets will first presumably test our response, and if we are unwilling to adjust, they could with impunity adopt the Chinese line.

ACHIEVEMENT OF WORLD POWER STATUS BY THE SOVIET UNION

Senator SYMINGTON. Another point that you mentioned which I never thought of before, which was especially impressive, was that when Stalin died, the Soviet Union was a European and an Asiatic power, and now they have become a world power.

So that nation has advanced a great deal since April 1953, has it not?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Yes.

Senator SYMINGTON. And that advance could only have been at the expense of the free world; is that not correct?

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Yes. I think there is a tendency for us to view the Communist expansion in very narrow territorial perspective. The Soviets have not really expanded very much since 1953. Indochina is the only place—ergo, they have been contained.

It seems to me that we overlook the fact, as I tried to suggest in my remarks, that the Soviet Union has now become a world power and this, in itself, is a major advance.

Senator SYMINGTON. Many people in this country, for reasons best known to themselves, are always irritated when you develop the reality of the Communist advance in so many fields—I have never quite understood why they were afraid to face reality.

Mr. BRZEZINSKI. Cassandras are never popular, Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the New York Times as of Tuesday morning, May 23, there is a penetrating column by Mr. Arthur Krock.

This article provides much food for thought when it says:

True, the Russians are not 10 feet high, and their leaders have proved as faulty in the reasoning on which they based some policies as their opposite numbers in the West. But the sequel, after the Kremlin perceived how the specter of a world opinion of its

own manufacture could be used to paralyze essential defensive movement in the United States, suggests that the Kremlin shaped its policies in advance to assure that the sequel would develop as planned.

Whether or not this clairvoyant statesmanship exists in the Politburo, the threat to summon world opinion has served the Soviet purposes very well at Geneva and in the United Nations. And, whether a determinable and concrete factor or a creation of the Kremlin, it still haunts this administration as it did the last, even though it no longer can shriek "fallout" to create the effects desired.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the New York Times of May 23 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

ONE U.S. SUCCESS AT GENEVA

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Ambassador Arthur Dean returned to Washington from Geneva last weekend with no tangible evidence thus far that he will be any more successful than his predecessors in negotiating with the Soviet Union an enforcible ban on nuclear-weapons testing. But there is evidence that he has accomplished something of importance at the latest Geneva conferences, and before he goes back to his post this week he deserves the encouragement of having this noted in the United States.

For the first time since these tedious and fruitless discussions began, doubts that the United States sincerely desires this treaty appear to have been allayed in allied governments. Also, the charge in neutral and uncommitted countries that the United States is responsible for the Geneva stalemate, and demonstrations which manifested popular acceptance of this charge, have shrunk to a minimum. Conversely, the Kremlin has become the growing target of this accusation.

The revisions of its original treaty formula the U.S. Government has made, which forced the Soviet Union to find new grounds for obstruction, have contributed greatly to this change in allied and world psychology. And though Ambassador Dean deserves much of the credit for the concept of the revision, others in the administration share it—notably the President and Ambassador John J. McCloy, his special assistant on general disarmament.

But it is Ambassador Dean's negotiating skill, and his experience in negotiating with the Communists, that has enabled him to use the new material to put the Soviet Union at Geneva more visibly on the defensive throughout the world for obstructing a viable treaty than it has ever been.

This may be all Dean will bring back from the conference at its next conclusion. But it is substantial because so much of the cold war has been an East-West battle in which the stake is persuasion of the onlooking world that durable peace with freedom is the true objective of one side and the opposite aim of the other.

However, in noting evidence of an achievement for which Dean will merit a large share of the credit if it proves firm and durable, it should also be noted that concern with world opinion in this and other cold war sectors has been a Soviet Russian sideline in contrast with the overwhelming influence that concern has had on the policies of the United States. From the time in 1956 when Adlai E. Stevenson at St. Louis proposed that the United States unilaterally end nuclear weapons testing (he modified that later) this influence has progressively (1) induced this Government to enter into the testing moratorium; and (2) allowed the Soviet Union to protract it indefinitely by stalling on control treaty talks.

Although the Atomic Energy Commission, members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, many military authorities and eminent nuclear physicists have urged two administrations to terminate the moratorium and engage in certain underground tests, on the contention that vital national security was being increasingly risked, both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy concluded that the risk this course would alienate world opinion was greater than the other.

They made this choice despite the long Soviet record of broken treaties and agreements that brings acutely into question whether the Russians have been cheating on the moratorium the United States has strictly observed, and are perfecting the small neutron bomb which could be decisive in nuclear war. And this situation, now over 2 years old, is made to order for Soviet purposes.

True, the Russians are not 10 feet high, and their leaders have proved as faulty in the reasoning on which they based some policies as their opposite numbers in the West. But the sequel, after the Kremlin perceived how the specter of a world opinion of its own manufacture could be used to paralyze essential defensive movement in the United States, suggests that the Kremlin shaped its policies in advance to assure that the sequel would develop as planned.

Whether or not this clairvoyant statesmanship exists in the Politburo, the threat to summon world opinion has served the Soviet purposes very well at Geneva and in the United Nations. And, whether a determinable and concrete factor or a creation of the Kremlin, it still haunts this administration as it did the last, even though it no longer can shriek fallout to create the effects desired.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my able and distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his thoughtful statement on this very important subject. I should like to suggest that there is perhaps one additional important reason why the officials of the Soviet Union are unwilling to accept international inspection within the Soviet Union. I refer to the secrecy of the Soviet society and the military, propaganda, and paramilitary advantages which secrecy gives to them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I completely agree with what the able Senator just said, and I am certain that one of the characteristics of this problem is the desire of a totalitarian state, especially one like Soviet Russia, to preserve from other people, especially people of the free world, what they are doing.

My primary apprehension in this field, however, comes from increasing apprehension about what the Soviet Union may be doing in the way of nuclear testing regardless of what is the reason for their present stand. I have been told by people exceptionally well qualified to speak on this subject that, if we wished to do so, we could be testing such possible new weapons as the neutron bomb without Soviet Russia knowing.

For over 2½ years, therefore, we may have been entrusting the future of the free world to the honor, sense of justice, and humanitarianism of the leaders of Soviet Russia. I do not assert that we have, but I do say we may have; and based on the record, that should be food for thought for every American.

CHANGE OF NAME OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INCORPORATED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 847, a bill to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 847) to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, which were, on page 2, after line 3, insert:

SEC. 2. That sections 3(b) and 6(a) of the Act of August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 486) are amended by inserting after the words "Distinguished Service Cross," the phrase "Air Force Cross".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, and for other purposes."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 3, 1961, the Senate passed S. 847, a bill changing the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

The House of Representatives amended S. 847 so as to include recipients of the Air Force Cross as eligible members of the Legion of Valor.

I have discussed the amendments with members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who are interested in this proposed legislation and I believe that the Senate should concur in the amendments of the House.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to S. 847.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF POLICE WEEK AND PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 65, designating Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day, which were, on page 1, line 3, strike out "May 14–20, 1961" and insert "May 13–19, 1962"; on page 1, line 8, strike out "15th" and insert "14th", and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating the week of May 13–19, 1962, as Police Week and designating May 14, 1962, as Peace Officers Memorial Day."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 1, 1961, Senate Joint Resolution 65 passed the Senate and as passed by the Senate designated the week of May 14 to

20, 1961, as Police Week, and designated May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

In view of the fact that the resolution did not reach the House Judiciary Committee in time to take action to carry out the designated purposes in 1961, that committee amended the Senate resolution so as to designate a week in May of 1962 as Police Week, and May 14 of 1962 as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

I have discussed these amendments with members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who are interested in this legislation and I believe that the Senate should concur in the amendments of the House.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate Joint Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder whether it would be possible to proceed with the consideration of one or two measures on the calendar before further insertions are made in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now proceeding under the head of call of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 266, S. 1189. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

TO AUTHORIZE THE COAST GUARD TO CARRY ON CERTAIN OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 267, H.R. 6845.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 267, H.R. 6845, to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that all the language after the enacting clause in H.R. 6845 be stricken and that there be substituted therefor the language in S. 1189, Calendar No. 266, the first item on the calendar. That is the language recommended by the committee. If that motion is agreed to and the bill is passed we will go to conference with the House on the bill. The reason for the requested action is that the House bill attempts to do the same thing that we attempt to do in S. 1189. However, the House did not use language which would allow the Coast Guard to have as one of its primary purposes the engaging in oceanographic research on the high seas. It relates particularly to their ice patrol; and it would allow the Coast Guard to collect oceanographic data through a kind of permanent research establishment. The House was attempting to do the same thing that our language attempts to do. However, the House language makes no reference to oceanographic research as such. The provision added in the House bill relates to functions of the Coast Guard, but not to a primary duty. In S. 1189 we make it one of the primary duties of the Coast Guard, along with other duties performed by that agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause in the pending bill and substituting therefor the text of S. 1189, as follows:

That title 14 of the United States Code, relating to the Coast Guard, is amended by inserting in chapter 1, section 2, after the words "rescue facilities for the promotion of safety on and over the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;" and before the words "and shall maintain a state of readiness" the words: "shall engage in oceanographic research on the high seas and in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," and is further amended by inserting at the end of chapter 5 the following new section:

"§ 94. Oceanographic research

"The Coast Guard may conduct such oceanographic research, use such equipment or instruments, and collect and analyze such oceanographic data, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government or not, as the Secretary determines to be in the national interest."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 5 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"94. Oceanographic research."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1189 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the action we have taken, particularly explaining the two purposes of the two bills.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

S. 1189, as amended, amends section 2 of chapter 1, and section 94 of chapter 5 of title 14 of the United States Code, relating to the Coast Guard.

Section 2 of chapter 1 states the primary duties of the Coast Guard, which includes "aids to maritime navigation, icebreaking facilities, and rescue facilities for the promotion of safety on and over the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and shall maintain a state of readiness to function as a specialized service of the Navy in time of war."

S. 1189, as amended, provides that a new primary duty be added following other peacetime primary duties, this duty being that the Coast Guard "shall engage in oceanographic research on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

This, the committee believes, is the language that is necessary in the above section and chapter to remove present statutory limitations on Coast Guard authority to conduct oceanographic research. The amendment was suggested by Government agencies.

Chapter 5 of title 14 relates to functions and powers of the Coast Guard. This includes authorization of aids to navigation, aids to distressed persons, vessels, and aircraft on the high seas, operation of floating ocean stations and other functions.

S. 1189, as amended, adds a new section to this chapter, and the additional function of "Oceanographic research." This section further provides that "The Coast Guard may conduct such oceanographic research, use such equipment or instruments, and collect and analyze such oceanographic data, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government or not, as the Secretary determines to be in the national interest."

The analysis of chapter 5 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following words: "Oceanographic research."

H.R. 4340 provides that section 2 of title 14, the section that relates to primary duties, shall be amended by adding the following new sentence: "The Coast Guard shall collect, analyze, and evaluate scientific data concerning the high seas and the navigable waters of the United States and shall cooperate and participate with other Federal agencies in the collection, analysis and evaluation of such data."

There is no reference made in this section to oceanographic research, and the provision added in the House bill relates to functions and not primary duties.

President Kennedy in his letter to Vice President JOHNSON of March 29, referred specifically to removal of "statutory limitations restricting the participation by the Coast Guard in oceanographic research."

The language of H.R. 4340 does not clearly state this purpose, and might not be interpreted as expressing this purpose. The Coast Guard already has ample authority and does collect, analyze and evaluate scientific data concerning the high seas and the navigable waters in connection with its primary duties of promulgating and enforcing regulations for the promotion of safety of life and property on the high seas, maintaining aids to navigation, and ice-breaking facilities. It does not engage in oceanographic research, which is the objective specifically authorized and intended in S. 1189.

H.R. 4340 provides that "section 90 of title 14 of the United States Code be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection '(c) The Coast Guard is authorized to develop, establish, maintain, and operate fixed and floating ocean stations, vessels, and shore facilities for the purpose of collecting, analyzing, and evaluating scientific data concerning the high seas and the navigable waters of the United States. In the exercise of the authority granted in this subsection, the Coast Guard shall utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, such fixed or floating ocean stations, vessels, and other equipment and facilities being operated by the Coast Guard in connection with other functions.'"

Section 90 of title 14, is the section titled "Ocean stations" and authorizes the Coast Guard to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air

navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States.

There is no reference in this section to fixed ocean stations, vessels, or shore facilities. The authority to operate floating ocean stations, and to operate them in connection with many activities which have scientific implications, is clearly stated.

The addition proposed in H.R. 4340 to section 90 contains no reference to oceanographic research. The scientific data referred to in this section of H.R. 4340 could be interpreted as meaning any type of scientific data concerning the high seas and navigable waters of the United States, or such scientific data as the Coast Guard is collecting now in connection with its meteorological or other services.

If the objective of this Congress is to specifically remove present statutory limitations which restrict the Coast Guard from engaging in oceanographic research on the high seas, that objective is not accomplished by H.R. 4340 which makes no reference to oceanographic research, confuses functions with primary duties, and misplaces under the section titled "Ocean stations," functions unrelated to such stations.

MODIFICATION OF LEASES OF RECREATION FACILITIES IN RESERVOIR AREAS

The bill (S. 48) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last year I introduced this bill and it was passed by the Senate. However, it was rather late in the session and it was not considered by the House. Very properly, the chairman of the committee introduced the bill this year. I ask unanimous consent that I may be included as one of the authors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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 the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to amend any lease entered into before November 1, 1956, providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of commercial recreational facilities at a water resource development project under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army so as to provide for the adjustment, either by increase or decrease, from time to time during the term of such lease of the amount of rental or other consideration payable to the United States under such lease, when and to the extent he determines such adjustment or extension to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. No adjustment shall be made under the authority of this Act so as to increase or decrease the amount of rental or other consideration payable under such lease for any period prior to the date of such adjustment.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 811) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF BRIDGE COMMISSIONS

The bill (S. 49) to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "an independent public accountant of recognized standing" and insert "independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States"; on page 5, line 5, after the word "made.", to insert "The Secretary of Commerce shall review such annual reports and audit reports submitted under section 1(b) of this Act and shall make recommendations to the Congress based upon such review, or take such other action as he may consider necessary, to effectuate the intent of the Congress as established by this Act or by the Act under which the individual bridge commission or authority was created.", and in line 24, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to insert "this Act and of"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each bridge commission and authority created by Act of Congress shall provide for an annual audit of its financial transactions by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States, in such manner as prescribed by the Governors of the States concerned and in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Each such commission and authority shall make available for such purposes all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, documents, or property belonging to or in use by such commission or authority. The General Accounting Office is authorized and directed to make available its advice on any matter pertaining to an audit performed pursuant to this section.

(b) The commission or authority within four months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made shall submit a copy of the audit report to the Governors of the States concerned and to the Secretary of Commerce. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital, and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Governors of the States concerned and the Secretary of Commerce informed of the operations and financial condition of the commission.

(c) The Governor of either State concerned or the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide for the conduct of further audits of any bridge commission or authority created by Act of Congress if the audit report submitted under subsection (b) is not satsifactory to said Governor or to the Secretary of Commerce respectively.

(d) The commission or authority shall bear all expenses of the annual audit of its financial transactions as required by this section. All expenses of any additional audit required under this section shall be paid by the official or agency requesting such additional audit.

SEC. 2. (a) Each person who is a member, on the date of enactment of this Act, of a bridge commission or authority created by Act of Congress shall continue in office until the expiration of his present term, except as provided under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Where provision is made in the Act creating a bridge commission or authority for membership thereon without limitation as to length of terms of office the Secretary of Commerce shall, on or before the expiration of ninety days after the date of this Act, reappoint not more than one-third of the persons who are members of such bridge commission or authority on the date of enactment of this Act as members of such bridge commission or authority for a term of two years from the date of reappointment, reappoint not more than one-third of the members of such bridge commission or authority for a term of four years, and reappoint the remaining members for a term of six years. Thereafter the term of each member appointed to such commission or authority shall be six years, except when an appointment is made to fill an unexpired term or when an incumbent member whose term has expired holds over until his successor is appointed, and vacancies shall be filled as provided under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) A vacancy in the membership of any bridge commission or authority to which this Act is applicable occurring by reason of expiration of term, failure to qualify as a member, death, removal from office, resignation, or otherwise, shall be filled by the Secretary of Commerce. Incumbent members whose terms have expired shall hold over in office until their successors are appointed and qualified.

(d) Each member appointed under this Act shall qualify within thirty days after appointment by filing with the Secretary of Commerce an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by law.

(e) Each member appointed under this Act shall be removable for cause by the Secretary of Commerce.

(f) This section shall not be applicable to ex officio members or State highway department members of such bridge commissions or authorities.

SEC. 3. Each bridge commission and authority created by Act of Congress shall submit an annual report, covering its operations and fiscal transactions during the preceding fiscal year, its financial condition and a statement of all receipts and expenditures during such period, to the Governors of the States concerned and to the Secretary of Commerce not later than four months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit required under section 1 of this Act is made. The Secretary of Commerce shall review such annual reports and audit

reports submitted under section 1(b) of this Act and shall make recommendations to the Congress based upon such review, or take such other action as he may consider necessary, to effectuate the intent of the Congress as established by this Act or by the Act under which the individual bridge commission or authority was created.

SEC. 4. Authority is hereby granted to transfer all functions, powers, duties, responsibilities, authority, assets, liability, obligations, books, records, property, and equipment of any existing bridge commission or authority created by Act of Congress to the highway department or other agency of the State or States concerned, or to joint agencies established by interstate compact or agreement. Such transfer shall be carried out in a manner as may be prescribed or authorized by the laws of the State or States concerned. Upon such transfer, such bridge commission or authority shall cease to exist.

SEC. 5. (a) All provisions of this Act and of Acts of Congress creating bridge commissions or authorities may be enforced or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy by the chief legal officer of either State concerned, in any court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the parties. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

Section 11 of the Act approved October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 699);

Section 15 of the Act approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 676);

Section 12 of the Act approved April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 144).

(b) Members and employees of bridge commissions and authorities created by Act of Congress shall not be deemed to be Federal officers and employees.

(c) The members of such bridge commissions and authorities shall each be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $20 for each day actually spent in the business of the commission or authority, but the maximum per diem compensation of the chairman in any one year shall not exceed $3,000, and of each other member in any one year shall not exceed $2,000. The members of such commissions and authorities shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 12 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission or authority. Ex officio members or State highway department members of the commissions or authorities shall not receive a salary for their services as members, but shall be paid their actual expenses not exceeding $25 per day for each day actually devoted to the performance of their duties as such members, and shall also be entitled to receive traveling expense allowance of 12 cents a mile actually traveled on the business of the commission or authority, whenever such reimbursement for their actual expenses and traveling expenses is not provided from some other source. Payments under the provisions of this subsection shall be in lieu of any other payments for salary or expenses authorized for service as a member of any such commission or authority under the provisions of any other Federal law relating to such commission or authority, but nothing in this subsection shall affect any other Federal law with respect to the funds from which any such payments shall be made.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall apply to any bridge commission or authority created by Act of Congress and authorized to construct and/or acquire an interstate bridge, including—

(1) Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, created by the Act approved May 17, 1939 (53 Stat. 747);

(2) White County Bridge Commission, created by the Act approved April 12, 1941 (55 Stat. 140);

(3) City of Clinton Bridge Commission, created by the Act approved December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846);

(4) Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, created by the Act approved October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 695); and

(5) Muscatine Bridge Commission, created by the Act approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669).

SEC. 7. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the New York Times of this morning entitled "Strong Will in Senate." It describes carefully the career and independent courage of our colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Because of the astuteness of the comments in the article and the full sweep of the views expressed there, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STRONG WILL IN SENATE—ALBERT ARNOLD GORE

When young ALBERT ARNOLD GORE played the fiddle at barn dances in the hills of Tennessee, people said of him: "ALBERT sure draws a wicked bow."

And years later SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, said of the junior Senator from Tennessee, "ALBERT is a very ambitious young man." Both remarks pointed up the same quality in Senator GORE.

Whatever he is doing, whether it is fiddling or politicking, he takes it seriously.

On Friday he put his heart into an attempt to kill a Kennedy administration bill for 40-year home mortgages. Yesterday he was back on the side of his fellow Democrats, assailing businessmen who seek tax havens abroad.

President Kennedy is the third man in the White House to discover that SENATOR GORE is a chronic independent.

"I call the shots as I see them, the Senator said yesterday, "and I have a habit of winning a few fights now and then."

SUCCESSFUL REVOLT

President Truman found that out in 1949, when Representative GORE led a successful revolt in the House against the administration's farm bill. President Eisenhower found the same fighting independence in 1955, when Senator GORE helped lead the battle against the Dixon-Yates power contract.

"I don't want anything from the administration," he said, summing up an independent's point of view, "except to help them have a good administration."

The Senator, of medium height and build, is notable for his handsome head of wavy gray hair, which he keeps meticulously groomed and parted down the middle. He speaks in a studied way, choosing his words with care, with only a mild southern accent.

He is on record as neither drinking nor smoking. He finds golf boring; instead he tries to get in a swim daily at the Senate Office Building pool.

But where Senator GORE really relaxes is on his farm near Carthage, Tenn., where he raises sheep, hogs, and other livestock. His greatest pride as a farmer is his herd of purebred Angus cattle.

Senator GORE was born on a farm near Granville, Tenn., on December 26, 1907, the son of Allen and Margie Gore. His forebears, he has said, "came across the mountain after the Revolution and started chopping timber. I still chop a little now and then myself when my fences need mending."

START IN POLITICS

He went to a one-room country grade school, then to high school in nearby Gordonsville. From there he went on to teach in rural schools until 1932. In that year he received a Bachelor of Science degree from Middle Tennessee State Teachers College and was elected to his first political post as a county superintendent of education.

Later he went to law school, driving 103 miles from his home to night classes at the Nashville Young Men's Christian Association 3 nights a week for 3 years. By 1939 he was running against five other candidates for the House of Representatives.

The seat had once been held by Mr. GORE's political hero, the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull. True to the Hull tradition, Mr. GORE advocated reciprocal trade in that election, and still does. But he found he picked up more votes by playing the fiddle.

He won the election and gave up the fiddle, turning instead to television as a campaign device. He was one of the first Members of Congress to use it extensively.

One of the Senator's political assets has been his wife, the former Pauline La Fon, who is also a lawyer and an effective campaigner. Their daughter, Nancy, 23 years old, was one of the first volunteers for the Peace Corps. They also have a son, Albert, who is 13.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in what he has said about our distinguished colleague, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I speak personally, and it is my belief, that because of the initiative shown by the Senator from Tennessee, we have as a result a better housing bill than we had before. I again commend the Senator from Tennessee, and join in what the Senator from Wyoming has said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished majority leader took the words out of my mouth. But beyond the bill to which reference has been made, I wish to state that during the 8 years I have served in the Senate with the Senator from Tennessee, no man has shown more courage, more integrity, and more intelligence than he has. This is exemplified in his voting record.

Mr. GORE. I am overwhelmed by the generosity on the part of my colleagues. I merely say to each of them, thank you.

CONNIVING BIDDERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to a startling matter concerning conniving bidders in my home city of Cleveland.

The city of Cleveland, early this spring, advertised for bids for 11 different types of watthour and demand meters. The total number for which bids were sought aggregated 4,060. On Friday, April 7, 1961, bids were opened, and all five bidders quoted the identical total of $68,691. The bidders were Westinghouse Electric Corp., Duncan Electric Co., Sangamo Electric Co., Allen Electric Co., and General Electric Co.

A week later, on April 14, 1961, officials of the five companies were invited to a meeting at the city hall to explain the identical nature of the bids. I quote from a letter from the outstanding mayor of Cleveland, Anthony J. Celebrezze, to our distinguished colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary:

> Our purpose was to inquire as to the reason or reasons for the seeming lack of competition, particularly since only relatively recently the General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., and Sangamo Electric Co. had plead nolo contendere to indictments in the Philadelphia District Court. The board of control decided to reject all the bids and readvertise for new bids. Further, a considerable quantity of used equipment was listed for trade-in, hoping to elicit some response from the bidders in that regard.
>
> On June 2, the bids were again opened, pursuant to the second advertisement, and they again were identical in all respects to those of April 7. Again, the aggregate bid was $68,691, and each of the companies refused to quote anything for the used equipment. The bidders were the same, except for Allen Electric Co., which did not enter a quotation.
>
> I think that you will understand the consternation which a public official feels when he is presented with bids which are identical to the penny. It is my considered judgment that the taxpayer has not been dealt with fairly, and that he is required to pay more than would be the case were the true spirit of competitive bidding practiced.

The mayor concluded his letter by stating that he was transmitting copies of the tabulation of the bids of April 7 not only to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is the chairman, but also to the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, for such appropriate action as the Attorney General might see fit to take.

Mr. President, on two occasions these companies submitted identical bids to the city of Cleveland, when only recently three of them, General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., and Sangamo Electric Co., had pleaded nolo contendere to indictments in the Philadelphia District Court.

Mr. President, here is a matter of grave concern to public servants on all levels of government and to the taxpayers of the country. They are being compelled to pay exorbitant prices when conniving bidders get together and there is a failure of competition.

I appreciate that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] first called this serious matter to my attention.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for having called this subject to the attention of the Senate. It is one of the most dramatic demonstrations of collusive bidding that I have ever seen. The facts are that five electric companies submitted bids identical to the penny—$68,691. When the Mayor of Cleveland called upon them to explain the bids and to rebid, four of the companies bid again—one of the five having dropped out—and again submitted bids identical to the penny.

I have calculated what the chances are that this bidding could have been done innocently. It was not one chance in a million or one in a billion or one in a trillion or one in a quadrillion; it was one chance in a tredecillion. In other words, it would be necessary to add 36 zeroes to the figure 1 in order to reach the single probability chance that these identical bids were not the result of collusion.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is the most arrogant kind of collusion. The Mayor of Cleveland did what he could do to get a break for Cleveland taxpayers. He gave the companies a second chance and told them to bid competitively this time. What did they do? Once again they bid identically. But to try to prevent this he said to these companies, "All five of you are bidding identically and precisely." To make it a little easier for them to compete, the Mayor said, "We ask you to bid on our used equipment and to give us some trade-in offer." He underlined that proposal.

The companies responded that they did not deal with trade-ins, and would not have anything to do with trade-ins.

I think the action of the Senator from Ohio in calling the attention of the Senate to the failure of General Electric, Westinghouse, Sangamo Electric, and Duncan Electric is most useful. The first three of those companies were, in fact, prosecuted successfully and found guilty. In spite of that action, they still persisted in the arrogant practice of refusing to compete effectively. The Senator from Ohio is to be commended for his statement. I wish to join with him in calling this practice to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for rendering so fine a public service.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the most monumental achievements of this Nation has been accomplished by those of our citizens engaged in agriculture. Their efforts have enabled us to achieve the highest standard of living in the world today. However, this achievement would never have been possible were it not for our farmworkers—those industrious, conscientious citizens whose occupation is one of the most laborious and the third most hazardous in our economy. I therefore find it incredible, Mr. President, that these citizens, the backbone of our entire society and economy, have been denied many of the legal protections which virtually every other group of workers in our country enjoy. It is even more incredible that among our agricultural workers, one group, our migratory farmworkers, has been living and working for some three decades under deplorable conditions—conditions which are totally and unequivocally inconsistent with every American ideal and principle.

During the past 20 months, the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor has conducted extensive studies in the field of migratory farmworker problems. In February of this year, the illustrious chairman of that subcommittee, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, introduced an 11-point legislative program especially designed to alleviate many of the most serious and crucial problems facing migratory farmworkers. These bills are of two basic types. Several of them—such as those which provide for improved educational opportunities for migratory children and adults, improved health services and facilities, and improved housing for migratory farm families—pertain directly to the unique welfare problems of the migratory farmworker. Other bills are designed to benefit the entire agricultural society and economy. Among these are proposals for a domestic farmworker stabilization program and an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act to apply collective-bargaining rights to agriculture.

Because of my interest in the legislation now pending before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, my attention was drawn to an excellent article entitled "Senator WILLIAMS Talks Farm Labor," which appeared in the May 1961 issue of Business Farming. Mr. Clifford B. Chase, who is public relations director for the New Jersey Farm Bureau, interviewed Senator WILLIAMS regarding the Senator's attitudes and philosophy on migratory labor legislation and wrote this extremely informative article.

The article highlights the perception and depth with which Senator WILLIAMS has studied this problem. His comments on various aspects of the legislation which he has introduced are enlightening. Because the article gives such excellent information on several of the more important aspects of a legislative program which will benefit farmworkers, their employers, and the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

> SENATOR WILLIAMS TALKS FARM LABOR
>
> Question. Senator WILLIAMS, how long have you been probing migrant labor problems in American agriculture?
>
> Answer. Officially since August 1959, when, at my request, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare created the Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, so that we would have a focus of responsi-

bility within one committee for the range of problems that are involved in this field.

Question. The migrant labor problem has been with us for a long while, but only in recent years has it drawn serious attention. What prompted the current Senate surveys into the problem?

Answer. There have been past legislative committee efforts to survey the migratory labor problem. They run back to the 1940's, and perhaps even beyond that. There have been programs, too, in housing and other fields. Most of the legislative effort died aborning, however, because very little was accomplished. The migrant farm workers have not been included under any of the legislation that has brought security to most industrial workers.

Question. Two years ago, however, you set up a series of hearings, which you held around the country?

Answer. Yes, after we created the subcommittee, the first order of business was to hold hearings in the late summer and fall of 1959. We held them around the country and conducted various field trips, too.

Question. Your visits included a trip to New Jersey, too, didn't it?

Answer. Yes, we conducted hearings in Trenton and then went on an extended field trip throughout the Garden State.

Question. You have introduced a series of bills which I presume attempted to cover some of the findings your committee had made. Will you explain some of the legislation you have proposed?

Answer. We now have an understanding of most of the inadequacies in the migrant farm labor situation. It covers a broad range.

We know that youngsters in migrant labor families are not being received into schools situated where their families stop on their trips north from Florida and Texas. We know that many of these children are falling behind in their education. We know that many of their parents are being neglected, and are not even aware of the rudiments of sanitary living.

As a result, we have proposed a plan of national support for local programs designed to bring these youngsters into the educational systems located wherever their families are working, for programs designed to bring just the rudiments of better living to the adults and for a housing program at the national level designed to develop facilities for migrant farm families.

These families are currently not brought under the umbrella of health and welfare programs where they temporarily reside. To overcome this, we have included provisions for child welfare, for day care centers and for the extension of regular public health services for these folks.

We know, too, that their wages have been excluded from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We have proposed a minimum wage bill which begins at 75 cents an hour, adapts the piecework method of payment, and which would bring a measure of security to these people. Beyond this we would register and regulate the crew leaders.

Question. I understand that in the new bills, one of the provisions is for collective bargaining for farmworkers. I didn't know this was included in the package. Is this a new feature?

I have not mentioned two or three of the bills we have introduced. One would create orderly opportunity for farmworkers to organize and bargain collectively, like industrial workers, who receive the protection of this right under the National Labor Relations Act.

We also have a legislative program which, we trust, would present a new stability to farmworkers through a more active program of recruitment of available laborers in areas where they are needed. We know that the present farm placement bureau, well motivated, has not had the muscle to do the job, so we would provide that muscle for better and more effective farm placement. We think it will result in better stabilization of our farm work force.

The other point I did not mention is a proposal that there be in this field a citizens' council, including growers and others who are familiar with and understand the situation, that would define the problem and recommend action—coordinate the effort for better conditions.

Question. Returning to the hearings, which of your proposals did you find raising the most opposition from farm groups invited to testify? Which found the most support?

Answer. We have had many farm organizations testify at our hearings held from coast to coast. There has been, I regret to say, a rather negative attitude on the part of organized growers and individual associations.

I find it difficult to understand how growers can disagree with our efforts to see educational opportunity brought to these youngsters and their adults, can disagree with our effort in trying to protect young people from the bitter hardship of stoop labor and dangerous work in the fields and can resist our efforts to try to eliminate the corrupt labor contractors who don't agree with us that better health and welfare should come to these people. They are excluded as no other Americans are.

It is difficult to understand the resistance to these most necessary, most humane and most inexpensive measures. I note, for example, that the Farm Bureau in some States is completely against these efforts. This is a tragedy because when you get below the officialdom of the organization and reach the individual members—the grassroots growers—they understand once you talk to them.

They know these people need help; they know they themselves haven't got the money, and can't get it through normal channels, to put up decent houses. This resistance can be reduced through humanity and logic.

Question. Your program would also create a Federal loan plan for farmers, who could borrow funds to build or improve migrant housing. Is there not the possibility here of growers considering this to be another way to force them to comply with a housing code, which may, in the future, be drawn up by a Federal agency? We already know that several States have housing codes now. The feeling might well be that the Federal code would supplant local codes and continue demands for more and more expensive improvements.

Answer. Our efforts in this field are to make money available at realistic interest rates to the individual grower, or groups of growers, for very simple but sanitary housing—no frills, no fancy codes. I fear no possibility of Federal bureaucracy imposing impossible codes.

Question. Where do you feel such a program is needed in New Jersey?

Answer. Almost anywhere there are migrant farmworkers.

Question. You have visited farms in New Jersey which used southern Negroes and Puerto Ricans. From these visits, would you say that these farmers generally have been trying to improve housing and working conditions?

Answer. I would say, by and large, their heart is in the right place, but that the resources are not available to make these improvements.

Question. The Puerto Rican program was set up by growers to meet a tight farm labor squeeze after the war. The situation with the colored workers in the migrant stream along the eastern seaboard is something else again, you say. Would you comment on the origin of this problem and offer an opinion as to whether you feel it is essentially a social one?

Answer. I believe there was a need to bring offshore workers to our harvest areas because we did not have enough domestic workers available to pick the fruits and vegetables at that time. I believe it is still true that at the peak of the harvest season, in many areas, there is an insufficient supply of domestic American workers to meet harvesting needs; therefore, we must bring in offshore people.

I would say, parenthetically, from what I have seen in New Jersey and in other States, too, that the offshore worker who comes here without his family is an individual whose living needs are more easily met than those of the traveling American laborer with a family. The former's housing and other facilities are better, for it is easier to barracks him.

I am particularly proud of the treatment Puerto Ricans, West Indians, and Bahamians receive in our State. Their needs are being admirably met. I have seen this.

Beyond this, however, we know there is a great deal of underemployment and unemployment in the American farm migrant community; therefore, our stabilization bill, with beefed-up support for the Farm Placement Bureau, will create more job opportunities for Americans whose occupation is farmwork. If this passes and if it works as we hope it will, there will be less need for importing labor, and there will be a new stability in the American farmworker community.

Question. If we were to agree that this is a social problem for the whole community, what is the farmer's specific duty as a short-term employer, and if society, through its pleas to Congress, is demanding certain social amenities for the migrant, should the farmer be compensated for what he spends for these purposes?

Answer. The migrant is there to pick the farmer's crops. The farmer needs him. To have workers, he must go beyond his own community and obtain migrant farm pickers. If he is going to do this, there has to be housing. Certainly the community cannot provide it. If the farmer needs these workers and they have no homes, he must provide housing.

We are trying to help the grower in such a way that he will be able, at modest cost, to provide decent housing. Most growers I know don't want their harvest folks living in shambles and shacks. They would like to see their workers decently housed, and that is what we are trying to do—give the grower a helping hand.

Question. Farmers feel they were badly dealt with in the television program, "Harvest of Shame." Do you feel they might be justified in sensing a softening-up process as one of the purposes of this film—to pave the way, publicitywise, for organized labor to move forward with migrant unionization?

Answer. It's too bad if farmers fear the organization of farmworkers into labor unions. I, myself, do not expect a national organization of migrant farmworkers in the near future. As a matter of fact, I don't expect it at all, because I think in the next decade or so there will be fewer and fewer migrant farm pickers. I think their decline will be due to two reasons: automation and stabilization of the farm work force.

In certain areas, unionization is arriving—in areas where the farmworkers are concentrated for relatively long periods of time, as in California. I frankly do not see active efforts at unionization of farmworkers who are picking in the northern stream or up the central part of our country, where the harvesting season is shorter.

Question. Do you think unionization would be confined to California, if and when it comes?

Answer. I feel this way. If much of our legislation is enacted, there will be less incentive for unionization because the legitimate goals of unionization—fair return for work and fair working conditions—will be achieved. There will be less need for the organized activity of a labor union.

Question. The farmer fears strikes at harvest time. As a small businessman, and due to the fact that he manufactures perishable products, wouldn't you say he is far more vulnerable than big industry, which merely can shut down its assembly line?

Answer. Any industry has its periods of vulnerability, when organized work stoppages or strikes cripple it more than at other times. Every industry has its critical period.

Question. If it is the family farm that Congress is interested in preserving in its many farm programs, do you think that small farmers could hope for any protection against this strike vulnerability?

Answer. Let me say that if they would support us in some of our inexpensive, most necessary legislative measures, they won't have to fear work stoppages for better conditions because this legislation will help them to create these better conditions. I believe our natural allies on many of these measures should be the growers, themselves.

Question. Do you feel that unionized farm labor might in the end force individual growers into some sort of a regional growers' association to meet on more equal terms the power of the unions?

Answer. If there are national unions, I would think there would be national farm groups for collective bargaining. It would not be bargaining on a farm-to-farm basis.

Question. The New Jersey grower is looking at the Mexican national program now, and wondering what future developments in California will mean in terms of his own employment of Puerto Ricans.

Answer: Of course, we recognize the dissimilarity of the two programs for these two groups of offshore workers. However, our approach has an element that would produce a similar result in either area—more aggressive efficient recruitment of American farmworkers. If this program realizes the goals we seek for it, there will be less need for the import of offshore workers.

This will not mean that our New Jersey growers will be without the necessary hands for the harvest season. It will mean that Americans around the farming areas will get more work and will be able to lift themselves from their present average family income level of $725 to one that can be truly lived on.

OZARK RIVERS AND NATIONAL MONUMENT BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in southern Missouri we have a system of rivers which flow through the most beautiful wilderness with which our Nation has been blessed. Fortunately, time and progress have left this area relatively unscathed. However, each year brings more blemishes to this quiet woodland of flowing rivers, and unless action is taken immediately I fear our Nation will soon lose this most priceless asset.

Our Secretary of the Interior has already prophesied that this year will see another 300,000 acres of our Nation's land fall to the bulldozers, cement mixers, and logging crews. This is necessary for the development of our Nation, but steps must be taken to insure orderly development of land. We can no longer afford the helter-skelter procedures of the past.

Provision must be made to insure that at least a part of our Nation's natural beauty is retained. Toward this goal, legislation has been enacted and many legislative proposals are presently pending, such as the wilderness bill, the open spaces bill, and the Ozark Rivers National Monument bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Missouri and myself.

One of our Nation's great writers on the subject of nature and its bountiful blessings, Leonard Hall, of Possum Trot Farm, Caledonia, Mo., has recently written a column which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat concerning the Ozark rivers and the national monument bill. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD, so it will be available to all Members of the Congress, as I hope this bill will be before us for action in the not-too-distant future.

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

OZARK RIVERS

(By Leonard Hall)

Most of the magnificent areas that make up our national parks have been acquired by the American people literally by default. Unsettled, unknown, unspoiled and generally owned by State or Federal Government, these areas were brought into the park system merely by arousing congressional interest.

That day is over. From here out, areas worthy of national park status will be saved only by tremendous effort of citizens devoted to the public interest. Big tracts of public land of this caliber no longer exist, while efforts to acquire even modest tracts, no matter how worth while, will increasingly compete with the interests of individuals and private groups. These may be oilmen, real estate operators, lumbermen, grazers, or others.

An example exists today in Missouri. Increasing recreational pressure combined with a long history of indifferent land use threatens the wild and natural beauty of our last free-flowing Ozark streams. The downhill trend started with overlogging open-range grazing, woods fires and hard farming of marginal lands. Now in addition, back-country roads reach every spring and gravel bar, tin cans and rubbish litter every campsite and unimposing and impermanent cabins line the banks.

RELENTLESS PRESSURES

These things will destroy the rivers in a few more years. Interior Secretary Udall generalized the danger when he said, "Pressures on our land are relentless. Another 4 million Americans will be born into our country this year. Given fair weather each day, and another 300,000 acres will fall to the bulldozers, cement mixers and logging crews."

A movement has started to prevent this destruction on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in the southeastern Ozarks. Local residents, conservationists at the State level and agences of government all agree the streams must be preserved in their natural state for the recreation and esthetic enjoyment of the American people. They also agree that any plan for the region should have, as an equal objective, raising the general economic level.

Two projected plans aim at achieving these desirable ends. The first is embodied in a bill introduced by Senators SYMINGTON and LONG of Missouri and Congressman ICHORD proposing a 113,000-acre Ozark Rivers National Monument on the watersheds of these rivers. This legislation is based on an exhaustive survey by the National Park Service aided by the University of Missouri and published by the Department of the Interior. The bill has the endorsement of the National Park Service, Missouri State Park Board, Missouri Conservation Commission, and many leading citizens.

The proposed monument takes into full consideration the potentialities as well as the needs and limitations of the area. It encourages development of the entire region outside the narrow limits of monument lands, on a free-enterprise basis, by tremendously increasing the flow of capital into the counties of these watersheds. It recognizes, in addition, that the low family income of the counties (estimated at 42 percent of the State average and in many cases less than $1,000 per year) results from these facts:

1. That while timber is a large potential resource, most private holdings have suffered a long history of mismanagement which puts any profitable sustained-yield harvest many years in the future. Even national forest lands (after 25 years of good management) produce yields of the order of less than $1 per acre per year.

2. That farm lands with a few exceptions are only one-third as productive as the State average, with resulting low tax revenues, a declining population and an advancing age level of residents left on farms as young people seek economic opportunity elsewhere.

3. That because of the small and unskilled labor force, restricted living facilities and power limitations, prospects for business development aside from future wood-using industries must be geared to recreation.

VAST EXPERIENCE

The National Park Service, with vast experience in preserving wild lands and managing their recreational use by large numbers of people, seems the logical agency to develop this national monument. Under the Symington-Long-Ichord proposal, the Park Service would encourage the area towns to create tourist facilities and businesses of every kind. It would cooperate with other Federal, State, and county agencies in further developing the entire region. Lands within the monument boundaries, except for an administrative unit and a limited number of regulated campgrounds, would be meticulously maintained in their natural state. Use of the area would, literally, be limited to recreation, including hunting and fishing.

SORENSEN FISH CO.

The resolution (S. Res. 90) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co. was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1004) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Company", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims, and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

NAOKO ISHIWATARI WHITE

The bill (S. 82) for the relief of Naoko Ishiwatari White was considered, 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, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Naoko Ishiwatari White may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The bill (S. 316) for the relief of Min-sun Chen was considered, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Min-sun Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MYUNG JA KIM

The bill (S. 373) for the relief of Myung Ja Kim was announced as next in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader concerning Calendar No. 255, S. 162, to create a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, to which objection was made at the last call of the calendar. Objection has been withdrawn. The majority leader has agreed that the bill may now be taken up out of order. I therefore ask the distinguished Presiding Officer to have the bill called up after the Senate has completed action on Calendar No. 274, S. 373.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and Calendar No. 255, S. 162, will be called up after the Senate has disposed of Calendar No. 274, S. 373.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 274, S. 373?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 373) was considered, 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, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Myung Ja Kim, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Margaret L. Foster, citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Myung Ja Kim shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 255, Senate bill 162?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 162) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit amendments on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert:

(8) one who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

On page 3, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "(8) one who shall be a prominent representative of the publishing industry", and insert in lieu thereof:

(9) one who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(10) one who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

On page 3, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "(9)" and insert "(11)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(12)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(11)" and insert "(13)"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(12)" and insert "(14)"; and on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(13)" and insert "(15)".

On page 3, line 3, after the word "of", strike out "seventeen" and insert "nineteen".

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendments are entirely acceptable to the sponsors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from New York.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I speak in favor of S. 162, as amended by myself and my distinguished colleague. I am glad that these amendments have been adopted.

This bill would deal an effective blow against the traffic in obscene materials that currently is undermining the moral fiber of the country.

As amended, it is not a rash or a hasty bill. It would establish no censorship, no repression, no police action of any kind. It would merely provide for study and subsequent recommendations on this serious problem by a commission of qualified experts.

Mr. President, we owe it to the youth of this Nation to set up this Commission. We owe it to the youngsters who are daily being infected by this outpouring of filth. We owe it to parents who are striving to create a moral and a healthy atmosphere for their children, and who find that the U.S. mails are being used by a cynical industry to debase and corrupt this atmosphere.

We have hesitated long enough. It is time that we take considered and deliberate action.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am gratified that the Senate has adopted my amendment to this bill, with the concurrence of the bill's sponsor, Senator MUNDT, as I feel that the addition of further members representing higher education and periodical publishing to the Commission will be of great assistance in providing for the representation of all interested and concerned parties.

The problem of obscene literature is one which is properly of growing concern to parents, community leaders, and government officials throughout the Nation, reaching, as it often does, our youth during their most impressionable years. Much of this literature is reported to flow in interestate commerce, establishing a particularly great responsibility in the Federal area.

On the other hand, careful consideration must be given to those who, in good faith, publish literary materials which may be controversial in character, as well as to the basic principles of free speech and the press, which must be carefully adhered to.

I am hopeful that the Commission to be established under this bill will give the most careful consideration to all these factors, so that the Congress, the executive branch, and the general public may have the benefit of the best and most composite information available in guiding their future actions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am pleased that the objection filed against S. 162 has been rescinded and I appreciate the cooperation of the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, in bringing this legislation up out of order at this time.

This is important legislation, Mr. President. As I announced at the time the bill was objected to, time is of the essence in this challenge to do something effective to curb and curtail the distribution of obscene literature through the mails of the United States. Those of us sponsoring S. 162 recognize the part this nefarious practice plays in contributing to juvenile delinquency and we are not all impressed by those endeavoring to perpetuate this traffic in filth. It should be stopped and the filth merchants should be exposed and prosecuted.

Passage of S. 162 will be an important initial step in cleaning up the mails of America and in protecting American youth against those who appear determined to pollute it. Among these promoters of pornography are operatives in the Communist conspiracy who realize that the destruction of a youth's morals is an effective prerequisite to the nullification of his religious moorings and to the overall weakening of the qualities of character which normally prevent him from becoming either a Communist or a functionary in a Communist front organization.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I am advised through Mrs. Germanine Krettek that the American Library Association is interested in this legislation and that the association would like to have one of its members included on the National Commission which the bill creates. Personally, I think this is a sound proposal

and I hope the American Library Association is represented on the Commission. I also hope the House moves promptly in finalizing the passage of S. 162.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the bill, as amended.

The bill (S. 162) 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,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of seventeen members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) Two from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of secondary education;

(8) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

(9) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the redio and television industries;

(13) One from among the attorneys general of the several States;

(14) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and

(15) One who shall be a chief law enforcing officer of a city or county government.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP UPON CHANGE OF STATUS.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Nine members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provision of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its finding and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than January 31, 1963. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local governments, and private organizations as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

KNUD ERIK DIDRIKSEN

The bill (S. 435) for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen was considered, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Knud Erik Didriksen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROMAN DACKOW

The bill (S. 674) for the relief of Roman Dackow was considered, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roman Dackow shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

AIDEH KOBLER

The bill (S. 722) for the relief of Aideh Kobler was considered, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of sections 201(a), 202(a)(5) and 202(b)(2) of that Act shall not be applicable in the case of Mrs. Aideh Kobler.

YU LIAO

The bill (S. 805) for the relief of Yu Liao was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yu Liao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

OCTAVIO JIMENEZ MARQUEZ

The bill (S. 817) for the relief of Octavio Jimenez Marquez was considered, 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 or Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Octavio Jimenez Marquez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriation quota for the first year that such quota is available.

VASILIKI YEANNAKOPOULOS

The bill (S. 825) for the relief of Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos was considered, 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, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Peter Yeannakopoulos and his wife, Angelina Yeannakopoulos, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

NAJM BOULOS RIHANI

The bill (S. 944) for the relief of Najm Boulos Rihani was considered, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. Najm Boulos Rihani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GUISEPPA LANZA LASCUOLA

The bill (S. 1373) for the relief of Guiseppa Lanza Lascuola was considered, 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, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Henry Lascuola and Marion Elizabeth Lascuola, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

TEREZ KASZAP—BILL RECOMMITTED

The bill (S. 1430) for the relief of Terez Kaszap was announced as next in order.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on June 6, 1961, Senate bill 1430 was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and was placed on the Senate Calendar.

Subsequent to that action, information which requires further study by the committee was received.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

DJURA ZELENBABA

The bill (H.R. 1293) for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANNA B. PROKOP

The bill (H.R. 1360) for the relief of Anna B. Prokop was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MODESTA PITARCH-MARTIN DAUPHINAIS

The bill (H.R. 1467) for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. COMBS

The bill (H.R. 1508) for the relief of Mary A. Combs was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KAZIMIERA MAREK

The bill (H.R. 1523) for the relief of Kazimiera Marek was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. SATO YASUDA

The bill (H.R. 1572) for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAH QUOCK

The bill (H.R. 1578) for the relief of Mah Quock was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MISS KRISTINA VOYDANOFF

The bill (H.R. 1621) for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. GEORGE BERBERIAN

The bill (H.R. 1622) for the relief of Dr. George Berberian was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MIN JA LEE

The bill (H.R. 1871) for the relief of Min Ja Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANNA STANISLAWA ZIOLO

The bill (H.R. 1873) for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PANAGIOTIS SOTIROPOULOS

The bill (H.R. 1886) for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EVELINA SCARPA

The bill (H.R. 2101) for the relief of Evelina Scarpa was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PIETRO DiGREGORIO BRUNO

The bill (H.R. 2107) for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WANDA FERRARA SPERA

The bill (H.R. 2116) for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HENRY WU CHUN AND ARLENE WU CHUN

The bill (H.R. 2141) for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The bill (H.R. 2158) for the relief of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

M. SGT. LOUIS BENEDETTI, RETIRED

The bill (H.R. 3846) for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD JACQUES GERARD CARADEC

The bill (H.R. 3489) for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CLARK L. SIMPSON

The bill (H.R. 3850) for the relief of Clark L. Simpson was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DAVID TAO CHUNG WANG

The bill (H.R. 4217) for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. FARMER

The bill (H.R. 4219) for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CASIMIR LAZARZ

The bill (H.R. 4282) for the relief of Casimir Lazarz was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT BURNS DeWITT

The bill (H.R. 4713) for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

REV. PATRICK FLOYD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Reverend Patrick Floyd may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GUISSEPPE GLORIOSO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 263) for the relief of Guisseppe Glorioso, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), Guisseppe Glorioso shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of that Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. KAZUKO (WM. R.) ZITTLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 331) for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "residence", to insert "if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That if the said Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That if the said Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

NISHAN DER SIMONIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 592) for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Bearge and Eugenie Hagopian citizens" and insert "Bearge M. Hagopian, a citizen", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nishan Der Simonian shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Bearge M. Hagopian, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSE ERASMO REINA (LAJARA)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "she" and insert "he," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration

and Nationality Act, Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara) may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIAN WALCZYK AND MARYA MAREK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1425) for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "John and Stanislaw Walczyk, citizens of the United States" and insert "John Walczyk, a citizen of the United States".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MARIA CASCARINO AND CARMELO GIUSEPPE FERRARO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2346) for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the name "Mr.", to strike out "and Mrs. Carmelo Leo, citizens of the United States" and insert "Carmelo Leo, a citizen of the United States".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ROSARIO BARRENA VILLACHOIA AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 85) for the relief of Rosario Barrena Villachoia and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Rosario Barrena Villachoia" and insert "Maria Rosario Barrena-Villachica", and in line 7, after the word "held", to insert "and considered"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Rosario Barrena-Villachica, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabella, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Rosario Barrena-Villachica, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons."

CHI YAN CHU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 172) for the relief of Chi Yan Chu, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Chi Yan Chu" and insert "Chew Chi Yan", and in line 7, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Chi Yan Chu shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chew Chi Yan shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Chew Ng Yuk Wan, a citizen of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chew Chi Yan."

MAY DAWN POLSON (EMMY LOU KIM)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 242) for the relief of May Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Kim", to insert "and Joseph King Polson (Sung Sang Moon)" in line 7, after the word "alien", to strike out "child" and insert "children", and in line 8, after the word "States", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim) and Joseph King Polson (Sung Sang Moon) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Vernon and Dawn Polson, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim) and Joseph King Polson (Sung Sang Moon)."

GEORGIOS TZOTZOLAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 266) for the relief of Georgios Tzotzolas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Georgios", to strike out "Tzotzolas" and insert "Laskaris Tgotgolas", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georgios Laskaris Tgotgolas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of the status of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Georgios Laskaris Tgotgolas."

GEORGE JOHN COUTSOUBINAS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 553) for the relief of Gorge John Coutsoubinas and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "George John Coutsoubinas,", and in the same line, after "Olga G.", to strike out "Coutsoubinas," and insert "Coutsoubinas and", and in line 5, after the name "Coutsoubinas", to strike out the comma and "and Agath G. Coutsoubinas"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olga G. Coutsoubinas and Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Olga G. Coutsoubinas and Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas."

FUNG WAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 700) for the relief of Fung Wan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fung Wan (Mrs. Jung Gum Goon), the widow of a United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of that Act and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fung Wan (Mrs. Jung Gum Goon)."

DR. PERKINS P. K. CHANG AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 942) for the relief of Dr. Perkins P. K. Chang and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 14, 1955, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Doctor Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng)."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I favor this bill, but I have a request that it go over, so I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

WAR RISK INSURANCE

The bill (S. 1931) to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance was considered, 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 1312 of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1542), is hereby amended by striking out "June 13, 1961" and inserting "June 13, 1966" in lieu thereof.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2457) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 120) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control was announced as next in order.

Mr. MUSKIE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

SHELLFISHERIES RESEARCH CENTER AT MILFORD, CONN.

The bill (S. 606) to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn., was considered, 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 the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized and directed to construct at Milford, Connecticut, a research center for shellfisheries production and for such purpose acquire such real property as may be necessary. Such research center shall consist of research facilities, a pilot hatchery including rearing tanks and ponds, and a training school, and shall be used for the conduct of basic research on the physiology and ecology of commercial shellfish, the development of hatchery methods for cultivation of mollusks, including the development of principles that can be applied to the utilization of artificial and natural salt water ponds for shellfish culture, and to train persons in the most advanced methods of shellfish culture.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $1,325,000 to carry out this Act.

TELLICO PLAINS, TENN., LAND TRANSFER

The bill (S. 848) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn., was considered, 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 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Tellico Plains, Tennessee, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain tract of land, together with any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 0.20 of an acre, in the town of Tellico Plains, Tennessee, known as the Fred Lee tract (621), such tract, which is no longer required by the United States Forest Service, having been previously conveyed by such town to the United States without consideration (by deed dated June 16, 1931) for use by the United States Forest Service.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two-tenths of an acre to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.

The land was donated to the Forest Service in 1931 on behalf of the citizens of Tellico Plains. The deed specified that the land was "to be used for the location and erection of a warehouse by the Forest Service, and for any additional purpose or purposes which in the judgment of said Forest Service may be deemed desirable." The Forest Service now has no need for the land and there are no improvements on the land of any value to the United States. Its return to the citizens of Tellico Plains by means of quitclaim to the town without consideration only represents fair play and equity. The deed to the United States was executed by Fred Lee and Gussie Lee on behalf of the citizens of Tellico Plains. Mr. and Mrs. Lee have no objection to conveyance of the land to the town.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AMENDMENT

The bill (S. 650) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder was considered, 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 the last paragraph of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; or any irrigation or reservoir company, water users' association, or similar organization having such authority that may be approved by the Secretary".

ABOLITION OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1040) to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the Act of January 31, 1934 (48 Stat. 344; 12 U.S.C. 1020), is hereby abolished; and, except as provided in subsection (d), all of the powers, duties, functions, and authority of such Corporation are hereby terminated.

(b) All right, title, and interest in or to real property other than reserved mineral interests which may appear of public record in any farm credit district to be in the Land Bank Commissioner or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are hereby confirmed to be in the Federal land bank of said district, and said bank is hereby authorized in its own name or in the name of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to execute any assignment, release, satisfaction, or other instrument as may be necessary or appropriate in connection therewith to perfect title of record in the true owners.

(c) All right, title, and interest to any reserved mineral interests of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation which have not been disposed of otherwise by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are hereby confirmed to be in the United States of America to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the mineral laws of the United States.

(d) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury (1) all cash, accounts receivable, and other assets owned by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and (2) all authority of such corporation relating to the collection of notes receivable from the Federal land banks.

(e) Any cash received by the Secretary of the Treasury, and any moneys collected by him, by virtue of the transfer made under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 2. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the date of such enactment, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 17, and 18 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1020, 1020a–1020h, 992a, 723(f)), are hereby repealed.

(b) Sections 32 (except the fourteenth sentence thereof), 33, 34, and 35 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1016–1019, except 1016(h), second sentence), are hereby repealed, and the fourteenth sentence of such section 32 (12 U.S.C. 1016(h), second sentence) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the word "such".

(c) The first sentence of the eighth paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 347), is amended by striking out "or by the deposit or pledge of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds issued under the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act,".

(d) The first sentence of section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 355), is amended by striking out "bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation having maturities from date of purchase of not exceeding six months,".

(e) The fourteenth paragraph of section 7 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 723(c)), is amended by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

(f) The last paragraph of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 722), is amended to read as follows:

"Amounts transmitted to Federal land bank associations by Federal land banks to be loaned to its members shall, at the option of the bank, be in current funds or, at the option of the borrower, in farm loan bonds."

(g) Paragraph Eighth of section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 781), is amended to read as follows:

"Eighth. To buy and sell United States Government obligations direct or fully guaranteed."

(h) Section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 781), is amended by striking out paragraphs Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Twentieth thereof.

(i) Section 22 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 897), is amended by (1) striking out clause (e) under the heading "In the case of a Federal land bank" and (2) striking out clause (e) under the heading "In the case of a joint-stock land bank".

(j) Section 62 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1138b), is amended by striking out "the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation,".

(k) The Act of June 4, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 1461; 12 U.S.C. 773a), is amended by striking out "the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation," and "the Land Bank Commissioner".

(l) Section 7(b) of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1648; 15 U.S.C. 712a (b), is amended by striking out item 4 thereof and by redesignating items 5 to 13, inclusive, as 4 to 12, respectively.

(m) The Act of September 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 769; 7 U.S.C. 1036), is amended by striking out section 4 thereof.

(n) Section 7(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, as amended (12 U.S.C. 636f(a)), is amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof.

(o) The second sentence of section 433 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act,".

(p) The first paragraph of section 493 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation".

(q) Section 657 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation,".

(r) Section 658 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation,".

(s) Section 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation,".

(t) Section 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation,".

(u) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by striking out "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;".

(v) The Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 741; 12 U.S.C. 1020a–1), is amended by striking out section 603 thereof.

(w) The last paragraph of section 32 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 992, 993), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that a statement in reference to the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND

This bill would abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which has been in liquidation since 1947. The committee amendment simply incorporates in the bill a number of technical amendments recommended by the Farm Credit Administration as being necessary to accomplish the purposes of the bill in a proper manner.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was established in 1934 to aid in financing land bank commissioner loans. Authority for such loans expired in 1947. As of June 30, 1955, pursuant to an act approved June 1 of that year all assets of the Corporation held as a result of the land bank commissioner loans, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, were sold to the Federal land banks. As of September 6, 1957, pursuant to an act approved September 6, 1950, all reserved mineral interests held by the Corporation and not involved in two court actions which are still pending, were transferred to the United States to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

The present assets of the Corporation consist of cash on hand in the amount of $194,557.40 and promissory notes of the Federal land banks in the amount of $2,191,156.94. These remaining assets would be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury. The cash on hand and collections on the notes would be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Pending actions by or against the Corporation could, on motion be maintained by or against the Secretary of the Treasury.

The committee amendment provides a method of perfecting record title to lands in which the Corporation may still appear to have an interest, repeals obsolete provisions for land bank commissioner loans, prevents the unintended revival of bond issuance authority heretofore repealed, and makes necessary drafting corrections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 1040 is to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a depression-born agency whose services have not been used during the past 15 years. This agency, however, while presently dormant still retains all of its previously conferred powers, including the power to borrow up to $2 billion and to pledge the credit of the U.S. Government for payment.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was established by an act of Congress on January 31, 1934, primarily for the purpose of enabling the land bank commissioner to make mortgage loans on farm properties on which the then existing lending authority of the Federal land banks had been restricted.

The Government held all the capital stock in this Corporation. It was authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue and have outstanding at any one time $2 billion in federally guaranteed bonds, and it could make collateral loans to the Federal land banks as well as purchase the bonds of those banks.

This Corporation did serve a necessary function during the depression years, but with the outbreak of World War II and its accompanying appreciation in Federal income and property values the services of this agency were no longer necessary, and since the end of World War II it has not functioned as a lending agency.

In fact, the authority of the Commissioner to make mortgage loans expired on July 1, 1947, except for refinancing existing loans, and no extension has been asked.

On June 30, 1955, all remaining outstanding loans and certain other assets of the Corporation were sold by the Corporation to the Federal land banks.

On September 7, 1957, all their mineral reservations remaining unsold were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with provisions of legislation enacted in September 1950.

In September 1957, the Government's investment in the capital stock of the Corporation was fully retired.

The Corporation, however, was not abolished; it still retains its authority—subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury—to issue and have outstanding at any one time $2 billion in federally guaranteed bonds. They still have authority to make collateral loans to the Federal land banks and to purchase their bonds. This authority is not being used, but it is still there.

The Comptroller General in his annual audits of the Farm Credit Administration for the past several years has strongly recommended that Congress take action to terminate the existence of the Corporation.

As of June 30, 1960, the only assets of the Corporation were certain notes receivable from Federal land banks in the amount of $3,933,116. These notes represent the balance due from the sale of the loans and other assets of the Corporation to these banks, and they are payable by the representative banks in annual installments.

Collecting these annual payments on notes from the Federal land banks and then transferring the proceeds to the Federal Treasury are the only duties left for this Corporation to perform. These payments could just as easily be made direct to the Treasury.

I repeat, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation during the depression served a useful function. It was started at a time when the Federal land banks were not in a strong financial position, and its purpose was to support these banks by providing additional capital for loans to the farmers during the depression of the 1930's. The Federal land banks are now, however, all in a strong financial position, and everyone agrees that there is no need for any funds or any support from this Corporation.

Although this agency has not made any loans since the depression years and even though the authority of the Commissioner to make mortgage loans expired on July 1, 1947, except for refinancing existing loans, we find that since 1950 over $4 million has been appropriated to cover their administration expenses.

Direct appropriations were suspended in 1955, during which year all loans and other assets of the Corporation were sold to the Federal land banks; however, during each of the ensuing years authority has been extended in the annual appropriation bills for the Corporation to make such expenditures from collected funds as were necessary to continue the liquidation of its assets. These expenditures, however, have been systematically reduced, and last year they were reduced to about $5,000.

But why any expenditure? Why keep a useless agency alive when it is not needed? No agency of the Government having the power to borrow and pledge the credit of the U.S. Government in the amount of $2 billion should be allowed to lie around waiting until some bureaucrat with a fanciful imagination decides to revive it.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Senate Agriculture Committee in favorable reporting this bill, and am glad that the Senate is today giving the bill its unanimous approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida wishes to state that the objections made by the official bodies were accepted by the distinguished author of the bill, the Senator from Delaware, and we understand were covered by the amendment.

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

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

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO AREAS WITHIN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, MINN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 302) to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make on the bill.

This bill concerns the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of the Superior National Forest, a wilderness area of approximately a million acres of land, streams, and lakes in Minnesota, formerly known as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou Roadless Areas.

In 1948 Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire nonfederally owned lands in this area. Appropriations have been authorized to carry out the 1948 act in the sum of $2,500,000, of which $250,000 remains unappropriated.

The 1948 act contained the following limitation on the acquisition of these lands by condemnation:

No contiguous tract of land in one ownership, not exceeding five hundred acres in the aggregate, shall be condemned if at the time of the approval of this Act it is encumbered with a structure or structures of a permanent type suitable for human occupancy and if the owner therof files written objections before expiration of the time for answering the petition in the proceedings.

Within the area covered by the 1948 act, there still remain to be acquired some 15,400 acres of privately owned land, consisting of 13 commercial resorts, 57 summer homes, and some unimproved properties.

There are about 15,700 acres of county ownership and about 110,000 acres of State-owned land. It is anticipated that perhaps half of the county land and much of the State land can be acquired by land exchange.

In order to preserve and protect the unique qualities of this area and complete the acquisition of the remaining needed lands, the bill would do three things:

First, it would remove the restriction on condemnation.

Second, it would increase the appropriation authorization by $2 million to $4.5 million.

Third, it would permit appropriations to remain available until expended.

Prompt completion of the program should avert the necessity of larger expenditures later, as rising land values and the addition of further improvements make acquisition more expensive.

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

The bill (S. 302) 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 the Act of June 22, 1948, as amended (16 U.S.C. 577c–557h) is amended by deleting the proviso from section 1 (16 U.S.C. 577c) and by changing the figure in section 6 (16 U.S.C. 557h) thereof to read $4,500,000. Funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Act shall remain available until expended.

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS' LICENSES

The bill (S. 1440) to amend the act approved July 14, 1960, relating to the establishment of a register in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle operators' licenses, was considered, 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 approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Commerce shall establish and maintain a register containing the name of each individual reported to him by a State, or political subdivision thereof, as an individual with respect to whom such State or political subdivision has terminated or temporarily withdrawn an individual's license or privilege to operate a motor vehicle because of (1) driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor, or (2) conviction of a violation of a statute of a State, or ordinance of any political subdivision thereof, which resulted in the death of any person. Such register shall contain such other information as the Secretary may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act."

IMPOSITION OF FORFEITURES FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS OF RULES AND REGULATIONS OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The bill (S. 1668) to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields, was considered, 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 title V of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"FORFEITURE IN CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 510. (a) Where any radio station other than licensed radio stations in the broadcast service or stations governed by the provisions of parts II and III of title III and section 507 of this Act—

"(1) is operated by any person not holding a valid radio operator license or permit

of the class prescribed in the rules and regulations of the Commission for the operation of such station;

"(2) is operated without identifying the station at the times and in the manner prescribed in the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(3) transmits any false call contrary to regulations of the Commission;

"(4) is operated on a frequency not authorized by the Commission for use by such station;

"(5) transmits unauthorized communications on any frequency designated as a distress or calling frequency in the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(6) interferes with any distress call or distress communication contrary to the regulations of the Commission;

"(7) fails to attenuate spurious emissions to the extent required by the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(8) is operated with power in excess of that authorized by the Commission;

"(9) renders a communication service not authorized by the Commission for the particular station;

"(10) is operated with a type of emission not authorized by the Commission;

"(11) is operated with transmitting equipment other than that authorized by the Commission; or

"(12) willfully or repeatedly fails to respond to official communications from the Commission;

the person or persons operating such station and the licensee of the station shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, each forfeit to the United States the sum of $100. The violation of the provisions of each numbered clause of this subsection shall constitute a separate offense: *Provided*, That $100 shall be the maximum amount of forfeiture liability for which any person shall be liable under this section for the violation of the provisions of any one of the numbered clauses of this subsection, irrespective of the number of violations thereof, occurring within ninety days prior to the date the notice of apparent liability is issued or sent as provided in subsection (c) of this section: *And provided further*, That $500 shall be the maximum amount of forfeiture liability for which any such person shall be liable under this section for all violations of the provisions of this section, irrespective of the total number thereof, occurring within ninety days prior to the date said notice of apparent liability is issued or sent as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

"(b) The forfeiture liability provided for in this section shall attach only for a willful, or negligent, or repeated violation by any such person of the provisions of this section.

"(c) No forfeiture liability under this section shall attach after the lapse of ninety days from the date of the violation unless within such time a written notice of apparent liability, setting forth the facts which indicate apparent liability, shall have been issued by the Commission and received by such person, or the Commission has sent him such notice by registered mail or by certified mail at his last known address. The person so notified of apparent liability shall have the opportunity to show cause in writing why he should not be held liable and, upon his request, he shall be afforded an opportunity for a personal interview with an official of the Commission at the field office of the Commission nearest to the person's place of residence."

SEC. 2. Section 504(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 504(b)) is amended by striking out "section 503(b) and section 507" and inserting in lieu thereof ", section 503(b), section 507, and section 510".

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar.

SUPPORT FOR SPACE BONDS GROWS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago I urged the issuing of space bonds by the administration in order to help finance our Nation's efforts in outer space. Unfortunately, the first reaction of the Treasury Department was negative. This was not the fault of Secretary Dillon. Since that time Secretary Dillion has personally indicated to me his interest in the proposal and his intention of thoroughly investigating its feasibility.

I am very glad to know that the idea will have further study within the Treasury Department. I have already received widespread comment upon the project and I believe it would have enthusiastic public support. It would have the advantage of permitting those who are most interested in the programs for outer space to invest in them.

The plan would give to those who have savings an opportunity to do some of the sacrificing which has been widely talked about for our national interest. It would be expected that the bonds would bear a rather low rate of interest. I think the greatest advantage of the proposal would be promotional in character.

At the same time, it could help to reduce some of the inflationary pressure which would result if a portion of the additional spending on space which the administration plans were financed through a shorter term bond issue.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point several editorials from all over the country supporting the idea of space bonds.

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

[From the Ashland (Wis.) Press, May 23, 1961]

BUY A SPACE BOND

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican, proposed that long-term space bonds be sold on the same terms as series E savings bonds to finance the cost of sending an astronaut to the moon. At an estimated cost of $40 billion, this would mean every person in the country could take a part in the project by buying $225 in space bonds. At the present pitch of enthusiasm for the successful space flight of Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., it should not be too hard to get people to buy a space bond for the first flight to the moon.

[From the St. Augustine (Fla.) Record, May 24, 1961]

BONDS FOR SPACE

Government borrowing of money from the public by sale of bonds to finance various projects—especially wars—always has brought a patriotic response from the American people.

They know it's a good investment because they will get their money back with interest. In other words, they prefer to lend the Government the money rather than lose it altogether through taxation.

Another war is being fought. It's the competition between the United States and Russia to move out into space for new scientific discoveries which it is felt will benefit man, and on the evil side of the ledger, to perhaps set up space controls.

Russia reportedly put the first man in orbit.

Along comes our Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr. He makes a nice easy trip and now everyone is excited about the next step. Uncle Sam wants to be first to put a man on the moon.

It is estimated it would cost $40 billion to do the job. We presume that buys a round-trip ticket.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, has proposed that the Government issue space bonds to help finance the astronaut program. It would cost every man, woman and child in this country $225 each to raise the fund.

The Senator's proposal is worthy of study. It might be better to put the program on a cash-and-fire basis, by withdrawing some of our tax fund outlays from the aid of nations which have doubtful or openly antagonistic attitudes toward our system of government and economy.

On the other hand, purchase of space bonds by the American people might give all of us a more personal incentive to keep this space program moving—particularly if we could sell some of them to the high-paid gentlemen who have been responsible for missile base slowdowns.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, June 3, 1961]

STEP UP, FOLKS, MOON BONDS

If this Nation must engage in an East-West race to see who gets to the moon first—a project on which we have written with no overwhelming enthusiasm—then at least America might be well advised to adopt the financing method proposed by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING.

He would have the Government offer long-term, nominal-interest space bonds patterned after the way the Government offers series E savings bonds.

The Senator figures it will cost about $40 billion to land an astronaut on the moon. At least part of the price of this effort, if not all, could be raised through space bonds purchased by all the patriotic people who endorse this project and who want to be a part of it.

Mr. KEATING says that as of now the Treasury Department has responded to his proposal with a marked lack of interest. He says the Department's plea that the idea involves too many accounting problems is shortsighted and he hopes "we won't allow accounting procedures to keep us from reaching the moon."

There is a nagging little bit of morality in this moon project which just won't be wished away—and this is how we can justify billions in Federal expenditures on a moon race, while at home we are baffled at the frightful problems of crime, divorce, discrimination, and how to take at least a toddling step toward peace on earth.

Separate, voluntary financing for the moon shot is a reasonable answer to the problem.

REPRESSION IN CUBA CONTINUES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President this morning an excellent article, the first of a series of four, appeared in the New York Times describing the full extent of police activities in Castro's Cuba. R. Hart Phillips, for 24 years head of the Havana Bureau of the New York Times, has recently left Cuba and she writes with great knowledge and deep personal experience of the totalitarian regime under which the people of Cuba are now repressed. Mrs. Phillips points out that

the mass arrests, the firing squad executions, the network of informers which Castro has set up, are at last awakening the liberal elements in Cuba to the seriousness of their plight.

Cuba now is indeed under a far more brutal tyranny than she has ever endured before. It is the devout hope of the people in the United States and, I am sure, of the people throughout Latin America that a way can be found to restore free government and economic development to the once sunny island of Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following my remarks the excellent and detailed article from the New York Times.

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

CASTRO'S REPRESSIVE ACTS AWAKEN CUBANS TO REALITY—CORRESPONDENT FINDS THE GLORIFICATION OF SCORNED ROLE OF INFORMER BRINGS AWARENESS OF TOTALITARIANISM

(By R. Hart Phillips)

Traditionally, the freedom-loving Cuban people have scorned a "chivato," or informer. But today in Fidel Castro's Cuba, to spy on one's neighbors and denounce them to the authorities is a patriotic duty.

It is this complete reversal of moral values that has brought the Cubans face to face with the harsh reality of the totalitarian Socialist regime imposed upon them.

The informers, organized in towns, villages and rural communities into "committees for defense of the revolution," were responsible for the arrest of the majority of the estimated total of 200,000 persons jailed following the unsuccessful April 17 invasion by Cuban exiles.

Some of those arrested were active counterrevolutionaries, but most were imprisoned on mere suspicion. The principal targets were the property-owning and professional classes.

One prisoner in La Cabaña Fortress, across the bay from Havana, said he had encountered there most of the lawyers and doctors he knew, including his own dentist. Also among the prisoners were officers of Premier Castro's army and militia who had been denounced by Castro supporters.

Few of the prisoners knew the charges on which they had been arrested, although some were told by the arresting officers.

Among women prisoners, who were being held in a private home when the regular prisons overflowed, was one who wept bitterly and told her fellow prisoners she had been picked up when the militia found a big iron chain in her backyard. They accused her of having furnished this chain to saboteurs to short-circuit a nearby electrical transformer the previous week.

Ten days later she was released without even having been questioned.

The revolution not only has drastically changed the political, economic and social life of the island but also has divided families and broken up friendships. "It is impossible even to trust one's own brother," said an enemy of Premier Castro, who had taken political asylum in a foreign embassy. He said his own family had betrayed him.

It has been estimated that the mass arrests following the invasion brought a personal taste of terror to 1 million Cubans. This is based on the assumption that each of the 200,000 arrested had an average of four close relatives.

RELEASE IS SLOW

Early in May the Government started to release slowly the majority of those jailed in the roundup. However, many were merely transferred from the temporary prisons, which had been established in theaters, baseball stadiums, private residences and Government buildings, to the regular prisons. Thousands are still being held, according to reports.

Many of those arrested had previously viewed the revolution with some detachment and even with hope. They had heard Premier Castro declare that anyone who did not enthusiastically support his revolution was a counterrevolutionary and an enemy to be eliminated. But they had not realized the ruthlessness of their 33-year-old revolutionary leader and his determination to impose the Government's will on the 6,500,000 inhabitants of the island.

The invasion and the roundup of suspects accomplished three things:

First, it increased Premier Castro's military strength by giving his followers more confidence and more determination to fight for him.

Second, it was a serious blow to the Premier's enemies, both at home and abroad.

Third, it ended the last hope of American residents of Cuba that relations between the United States and Cuba would ever be friendly as long as Dr. Castro remained in power.

SUPPORT HARD TO ESTIMATE

It is hard to estimate the percentage of Cubans who support the Castro regime. Even the Government's bitterest enemies refuse to discuss any aspect of the revolution except with trusted friends.

On the other hand, thousands gather at rallies and cheer the Premier deliriously. They listen patiently in driving rain or under broiling sun to the Premier's speeches, which seldom last less than 3 hours. They sing and chant revolutionary slogans with evident enthusiasm.

These crowds are composed of workers, peasants, and students. There is no doubt that most of the teenagers and younger children consider Premier Castro the greatest leader in Cuban history. However, it is believed that a majority of the students at Havana University, where Roman Catholic influence is strong, are opposed to the Socialist state.

The peasants are ardent supporters of the Government, although some of them are disturbed by the open embracing of communism. They find it exhilarating to hear that the revolution is only for them and to see their children clothed, educated, and trained for jobs.

PEASANTS BELIEVE PROMISES

Perhaps they do not yet have a new house or any land of their own, but they firmly believe that the promises of Premier Castro will be fulfilled. Besides, they like to wear the uniform of the militia and they enjoy the feeling of importance that goes with having guns in their hands.

Many of the industrial and commercial workers are unhappy over the turn of events. Nevertheless, they attend the required meetings and cheer lustily. Otherwise, they face the prospect of being purged by those among their fellow workers who are more enthusiastic supporters of the revolution. Many workers are keeping their jobs by giving lipservice to the revolution.

HAVANA IS GAY NO MORE

Gay, cosmopolitan Havana, once so dear to the hearts of American vacationists, is gone. Today it is a city where armed militia walk the streets and stand guard against saboteurs at what once were privately owned manufacturing plants and commercial enterprises.

The large tourist hotels no longer have an atmosphere of luxurious living. They are filled with earnest-faced, badly dressed delegations of workers, students and peasants from Latin American or Communist countries.

In the formerly exclusive Miramar residential district, hundreds of homes from which the wealthy and middle class have fled are now occupied by Government officials or have been converted into boardinghouses for children of workers and peasants who are being educated by the Government.

The big private clubs, once centers of social activity of the upper classes, are now social centers for workers.

Premier Castro's May 1 proclamation of a Socialist state did not surprise the Cuban people. The Soviet Union and Communist China have always been referred to by the Castro officials as Socialist countries so there were no illusions as to the type of socialism embraced by the young revolutionary leader.

The people had long heard the Premier and his officials enthusiastically praise the Communist countries as the "best friends" of Cuba. They had heard the Premier repeatedly declare that the United States was the "worst enemy" not only of Cuba but also of all free people in the world and that the hope of world peace and the well-being of the "humble" lay with the Communist world.

Even before the May Day announcement, the fanatical followers of Premier Castro had marched past the reviewing stand carrying banners reading: "Long Live Our Socialist Revolution."

The new slogans were ready, so that the crowd responded to Premier Castro's speech with cries of "Fidel, Khrushchev, we are with you both."

ANNOUNCEMENT PREDICTED

Enemies of Premier Castro had long predicted the formal announcement that his was a Socialist regime. They had noted that Government officials had been declaring that if the Cuban revolutionary reforms were communistic, then "we are Communists."

The Communist Party, the only political organization permitted to exist, had by press and radio long urged socialism as the answer to all Cuba's problems. And the Premier had linked his revolutionary ideals with Marxism so closely that the two had become synonymous in the public mind.

But Premier Castro is determined to maintain full control of his new Socialist state. Since the day he marched into Havana at the head of his revolutionary troops in January 1959, he has demonstrated again and again that he is the supreme authority in Cuba. The public has accepted this as a fact since a few weeks after he came to power, when he summarily removed President Manuel Urrutia Lleo, who had the full respect of the people.

Neither Dr. Castro's friends nor his enemies believe he will accept orders from Moscow. His conviction that he is playing a leading role in world affairs is too great for that. However, it is evident that he has been amenable to suggestions and offers of economic and political cooperation.

Premier Castro has been so eager to convert Cuba's former capitalistic system to socialism that some Cubans believe even the Russians have been startled by the headlong speed with which he has been changing the political, economic, and social structure.

The Premier has borrowed ideas from various Communist countries. His agrarian reform is said to resemble that of Communist China and he has asked Eastern European countries for guidance in reorganizing Cuba's administrative setup.

Since the Soviet Union is Cuba's only source of petroleum, and since most of the island's all-important sugar crop is destined to be exported to the Communist bloc on a barter basis, the Cuban Government depends for its very existence on the Communist countries.

Encouraged and supported by the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries, Premier Castro sees only one obstacle to a long and successful rule—the United States.

WARNS OF A U.S. ATTACK

The Cuban exiles' invasion had hardly been defeated when the Premier began warning the people that U.S. armed forces would surely attack the island.

At the same time, the flow of arms from the Communist countries has continued. Premier Castro has repeatedly boasted of the tremendous quantity of arms now in Cuba's possession. It is evident from the armaments that have been displayed by the Castro forces that their value must run into the millions of dollars. And Dr. Castro has declared that more will be received.

The cost of these arms and the basis on which they are being received are secrets that have been well kept by the Cuban Government.

However, economists in Cuba have noted that the value of the manufacturing machinery, transportation equipment and other industrial and commercial supplies Cuba is receiving from the Communist countries seems about equal to the value of the sugar and other products the island is exporting to these countries.

Therefore, they reason, Cuba must be getting the arms free.

Premier Castro is using the alleged threat from the United States as a weapon to crush his opposition. He is fully aware that he does not, as he claims, have the "support of all the Cuban people." But with about 500,000 men and women in the militia, who are subject to regular army discipline and who are armed only when on duty under military orders, he is confident that he can defeat any invasion and crush any possible uprising.

Even before the mass arrests in April, it was estimated that Cuban prisons held 25,000 persons. Many of these prisoners were serving sentences ranging up to 30 years, while others had never been tried. Military trials are still being held and executions are said to continue.

There is every indication that the terror engendered by the recent mass arrests will be maintained by the continual arresting and releasing or trying of those who show no enthusiasm for the revolution. It is unofficially estimated that the Castro regime has executed more than 600 persons since it came to power in 1959. The majority of these were officials and collaborators of the Batista regime. But with counterrevolutionary activities now punishable by death, the firing squads are expected to continue in action.

UNDERGROUND IS SHAKEN

The underground organizations that have been carrying out terrorism and sabotage against the Castro government for many months were badly shaken by the extreme repressive measures that followed the invasion.

The underground is composed chiefly of angry and disillusioned young men and women who once were ardent supporters of Premier Castro. In fact, many of them served in the Castro underground during his 2-year revolt against the Batista regime.

One youth bitterly summarized recently the feelings of many:

"Castro promised respect of individual rights, respect of private ownership, the reestablishment of the Constitution of 1940 and elections within eighteen months.

"And now what do we have? A Socialist government, a police state—in fact, the worst dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere."

How many Cubans are members of the underground? No one knows with any accuracy. There are five groups that work together, although each maintains its own identity. They have infiltrated every Government department as well as the militia and the army. But they live in constant danger—the danger of execution by firing squad or long prison sentences.

The underground groups' greatest difficulty is to keep Government agents out of their ranks, because of the eagerness and dedication with which the young followers of Premier Castro carry out his orders to act as voluntary spies.

Moreover, there are thousands serving in the dreaded army intelligence service, known as G-2, and other secret repressive corps. All of these groups are under the direct command of Raul Castro, the Premier's younger brother, who is Armed Forces Minister, and their only duty is to eradicate all opposition to the Government.

The underground lost thousands of dollars worth of arms and explosives in the nationwide house-to-house search that followed the invasion. It will take many months for the Premier's foes to collect such weapons again to carry out effective sabotage and terrorism, even if they escape the campaign of liquidation that Dr. Castro has instituted.

COMMUNISTS DEFY THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Supreme Court, in two recent decisions, dealt a massive blow to the foreign-directed U.S. Communist Party's attempts to subvert the American way of life.

Gus Hall, head of the Communist Party in the United States, has announced that the Communists will defy the Supreme Court. This announced intention to disobey the law of our land should come as no surprise. If the Communists had their way, they would abolish the Constitution and all the rights which America holds dear. The Communists frequently speak of ideals; but the only so-called ideal which the Communists are really interested in is that of Communist world domination. The brutal takeover in Padong, in violation of an announced truce and just 2 days after Khrushchev supposedly recognized the importance of a cease-fire in Laos, illustrate the Communist version of ideals, and the Communist tactics. To them, ideals—as Americans understand the word—are merely something to use and exploit in order to attain their final objective of world domination. It does not matter to them how this objective is achieved.

One of the hallmarks of all freedom-loving people is respect for the law. Now we know that the Communists reject this ideal, just as in practice they reject virtually every safeguard of liberty and freedom. They attempt to disguise their totalitarian objectives in the garbs of freedom, but their actions show that they are willing to destroy the concepts of freedom whenever they stand in their way.

The American people will not be misled by Communist doubletalk. Only by supporting the vigorous fight against communism can America hope to preserve our democratic ideals.

Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune in a recent editorial explained in very cogent terms the basis for the Supreme Court's decisions. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 8, 1961]

THE GOVERNMENT'S RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

In matters of national security, limits may rightfully be placed on the exercise of individual liberties as long as those limits are reasonably drawn and clearly stated.

Two far-reaching Supreme Court rulings this week recognized the Government's right to take defensive actions against the Communist Party. In one, it upheld the requirement that the party and its front groups register under the Internal Security Act of 1950, listing officers and members and accounting for funds, including their source. In another, it upheld the membership clause of the Smith Act, permitting conviction—provided certain criteria are met—for membership in the Communist Party. These criteria, however, set important limits. The member must be active, and he must personally have a specific intent to bring about violent overthrow of the Government. The court reiterated that advocacy of the mere abstract doctrine of forcible overthrow is not sufficient.

Together, these two rulings strike a powerful blow at what remains of the Communist organization in this country. Each caps a long legal battle. Both touch on basic first amendment freedoms.

In a dissent, Justice Black wrote: "The first banning of an association because it advocates hated ideas—whether that association be called a political party or not—marks a fateful moment in the history of a free country. That moment seems to have arrived for this country."

The Communist Party, however, is a special case. It is not just another political party; neither is it an ordinary representative of a foreign power or an oganization devoted to the mere passive advocacy of ideas. It represents the interests of this Nation's chief adversary in a worldwide struggle for immense, incalculable, stakes. It uses secrecy, subversion, duplicity. Advocacy and action are, in its program, inextricably intertwined. It aims at overthrow of the Government by force, and its actions toward that end are coordinated with a worldwide revolutionary movement directed from abroad.

It is a conscious arm of an international conspiracy.

Measures directed against such an organization are clearly not precedents for future action against groups which merely advocate ideas, however hateful. Crucial here is the control of the Communist movement from abroad, and its use, in Justice Frankfurter's words, of "every combination of possible means, peaceful and violent, domestic and foreign, overt and clandestine, to destroy the Government itself."

The Court's rulings are consistent with the American tradition of liberty, inherent in which is the people's right to defend that liberty against force and subversion.

MR. SAM, TEXAS' MOST BELOVED AND HONORED STATESMAN, SETS NEW RECORD TODAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at noon today a notable milestone was passed in congressional history. This noon marked the moment when Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Texas' most beloved and honored statesman, had served as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives for 16 years and 273 days, which is exactly twice as long as any other leader in the history of this Nation. The man with the second closest record was the distinguished Henry Clay.

Texans are extremely proud and fortunate to have sent some great men to Washington. But for all the greatness of other leaders, Mr. SAM has made a contribution to American Government and American life that literally dwarfs the accomplishments of most leaders.

Down through the years, many have noted with sadness that this great American—because of a bad break of time and circumstance—had not had the opportunity to serve as President. His record of service shows he would have given outstanding service in the highest office in America. Indeed, his service as House Speaker, working with both Democratic and Republican Presidents, has been so exceptional that few of our Presidents have matched the totality of his contribution to fair, efficient, responsible, progressive, concerned government by consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an outstanding article by Mr. Robert C. Albright published in the Washington Post June 11, 1961, entitled "Mr. Sam, Storekeeper, Is a Great Rider, Too."

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

MR. SAM, STOREKEEPER, IS A GREAT RIDER, TOO

(By Robert C. Albright)

President Kennedy tells the story of a call received at the White House switchboard one day when he was in Canada, Vice President Johnson was in Asia, and Secretary of State Rusk was in Geneva.

"Who's keeping the store?" demanded the frustrated caller after trying to reach each of them.

"The same man who's always kept it, SAM RAYBURN," retorted the operator.

Salty Mr. SAM, "Mr. Congress" to many, has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man. He's been keeping the store off and on for four Presidents of the United States. All told, he's served along with eight, starting with one of his heroes, Woodrow Wilson, since he first came to Congress on March 4, 1913.

But never say that he served under any man.

"Don't use that word 'under,'" he once told an interviewer. "I've never served under anybody. I've served with them."

The House of Representatives is his greatest love, and the speakership, sometimes described as the second most powerful office in the land, his summit. He never aspired much beyond it, although the Presidency distantly beckoned before he turned 60. (He's now 79.) In 1946, Congress passed a law making the Speaker third in line of succession to the Presidency.

That's close enough for the squire of Bonham.

DOUBLE MEASURE

RAYBURN's firm but benevolent rule of the House, probably the most complete any House leader has known since the vast powers of "Uncle Joe" Cannon were clipped by a bipartisan liberal revolt in 1910, is about to pass a new milestone.

At noon Monday he will have been Speaker exactly 16 years and 273 days, allowing time for two interregnums—the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses.

That's exactly double the previous record of 8 years and 136½ days. The earlier mark was set by another of the heroes of RAYBURN's history-worshiping youth—Henry Clay, the brilliant Whig from Kentucky who left the House to shine still brighter in the Senate.

RAYBURN equaled Clay's service in the Speaker's office on January 30, 1951. He has smashed many another tenure record. He's seen about 3,000 Congressmen come and go. No Member of the House has served more years in Congress, although CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate, who first went to the House in 1911, has served longer in both Houses. The only House Member remotely approaching RAYBURN's service record is 77-year-old CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, who first came to the House some 21 months after RAYBURN.

Yet the word retirement isn't in RAYBURN's vocabulary, say those who know him best. Physically, he appears as sound at 79 as he was at 60. On a recent trip home to his ranch in Bonham, Tex., he was given a thorough checkup by his personal physician.

"You'll live to be 106," was the verdict.

"I'll settle for 104," chuckled RAYBURN. "It's because I've been having my way," he told a friend who complimented him on his good health.

RAYBURN never used a more apt phrase.

He's been having his way in the House, where he usually manages to stay on top of a House majority despite occasional forays from the right and the left. And he's been having his way pretty much in national politics.

For one thing, his candidate for President, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, came up with the costarring role on the Democrats' John F. Kennedy ticket. For RAYBURN, it was reliving history. Back in 1932, he had floor-managed the presidential campaign of John Vance Garner in the Democratic Convention that nominated Roosevelt and Garner.

Occassionally, he's been having his way at the White House, too, with Presidents he serves "with" and not "under."

His advice is sought in top places. When it isn't, he sometimes volunteers it.

For example, he told his good friend Harry Truman after he was sworn into the Nation's highest office in 1945: "I have seen people in the White House try to build a fence around the White House and keep the very people away from the President that he should see. * * * That is one of your hazards."

"I gave him the same advice that I gave Mr. Eisenhower and that I have given Mr. Kennedy," he later elaborated.

RAYBURN's formula for running the House is typically Texan: "I try to ride the horse." But the Speaker attributes his longevity in Congress to another infallible rule: "Be reasonable, be fair."

He has a few other homespun guidelines. One of RAYBURN's homilies: "It doesn't make any difference how much sense you've got if you haven't got any judgment."

During the nearly 17 years he's been Speaker, RAYBURN usually has managed to gage the House mood, as indefinable sometimes as a balky Texas bronc.

Three years ago, the Chamber's growing group of House Democratic liberals came to him for aid in breaking Democratic bills out of Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia's coalition-controlled House Rules Committee.

RAYBURN agreed that the key bills must come out, but asked time to act through normal leadership channels. SMITH and his coalition refused to budge.

When the 87th Congress convened, the liberals again were waiting at the Speaker's door. This time there was another interested party, President John F. Kennedy, who had a program to move. RAYBURN tried once more, unsuccessfully, to reason SMITH into making a commitment. When that failed, he got out his spurs.

The Speaker threw his backing behind a resolution enlarging the Rules Committee from 12 to 15. The contest was a cliffhanger, with the bulk of House Republicans voting with southern Democratic holdouts. But RAYBURN rode the horse and won the count 217 to 212.

"It was a fight I had to win," said the Speaker.

RAYBURN remembers other donnybrooks he could not afford to lose, but none more dramatic than a rollcall taken on a hot August day in 1941. President Roosevelt was pressing for extension of the draft and the House opposition was intense.

RAYBURN made one of his rare speeches from the House well and undoubtedly influenced the outcome. The vote was 203 to 202—for extension. Dissipation of our military manpower had been averted just 4 months before Japan struck at Pearl Harbor.

Tie votes are fairly common in the Senate. But in all the years he has been Speaker, RAYBURN recalls only one actual tie in the House that he was called on to break. That was back in 1957 when he cast the deciding ballot in favor of a measure sponsored by the House Interstate Commerce Committee.

On another close count, RAYBURN voted to "make a tie" in order to kill an unwanted amendment.

Born in Roane County, Tenn., one of 11 children, "Mr. SAM" is the son of a Confederate soldier who rode with Lee through Appomattox. He was only 5 when his father moved the family to Texas and settled on 40 acres near Bonham.

It was a lonely life, he recalls. When he wasn't farming he read voraciously. "By the time I was 9 or 10, I had read every history book I could find—everything I could get hold of about Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, the Adamses, Monroe, Madison and all I could about the men then in public life."

It was while he was picking cotton, down near Flag Spring, Tex., that he decided he wanted to be Speaker: "There is a lot of time to contemplate when you are picking cotton."

He was educated in a two-teacher school and then at East Texas Normal School, working his way through, teaching school a year to pay for another year of college.

When he was 24 he was elected to the Texas Legislature. At Austin, the State capital, he also studied law at the University of Texas. When he was 29 he was elected Speaker of the Texas House, the youngest man ever chosen until then. The next year he was elected to Congress, and has held his Fourth District seat ever since.

It was while he served in the Texas Legislature that RAYBURN met and became friends with the father of LYNDON JOHNSON, then a member of the State legislature. That friendship was to effect the lives of both. When LYNDON was elected to Congress in 1937, RAYBURN offered him fatherly guidance in the legislative jungle which then was the House.

In later years, when JOHNSON went on to the Senate, to a leadership post of his own and renown as a legislative craftsman, RAYBURN, outshone, was still JOHNSON's most enthusiastic rooter.

Inevitably it was RAYBURN who captained his campaign and who was the man JOHNSON asked John F. Kennedy to clear with when he proferred him the vice presidential nomination in Los Angeles.

RAYBURN says today that he was never against Kennedy—he was just for JOHNSON. Today he appears equally enthusiastic for Mr. Kennedy.

"He's one of the easiest men to talk to I have ever known," says the Speaker. "He understands everything you say and he damned well knows what he's saying."

He thinks the country will be surprised how much of Mr. Kennedy's program Congress puts through in the first year.

The late Champ Clark was Speaker when RAYBURN first took his House oath. He

doesn't rank Clark with the great Speakers. He's inclined to go back to another strong House presiding officer, Thomas B. Reed of Maine, who wielded a firm gavel in the 1890's.

He doesn't consider his friend, John Nance Garner, in the running because he presided as Speaker for less than one term before running for Vice President.

Of the late Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, who succeeded Garner as Speaker, RAYBURN says: "He was a very fine man and very able—a real good Speaker."

In his estimate of the Presidents he's served with, he never downgrades the office but does make some fine distinctions. In an outspoken interview for the CBS television network last February 26, he spelled out his recollections of the last eight Chief Executives.

For example, he said that history "is going to be mighty kind to Mr. Truman. I think it is going to put him way up among our great Presidents."

He said that Mr. Eisenhower is a "good man" and was "a great general." He says: "I still think Mr. Eisenhower is a great patriot; I think he wanted to serve his day and generation well, and I—well—I think history will be just to him."

Of Wilson: "He was a great scholar, a great historian, and I think he was a great statesman."

Of Harding: "He was a very gracious man. I never thought Mr. Harding was a dishonest man—I don't think there has ever been a President who was a dishonest man. I think Mr. Harding trusted too many men."

Of Coolidge: "They say he was a great silent man but he talked aplenty. Coolidge said one of the smartest things that was ever said: 'I found out early in life you did not have to explain something you hadn't said.' "

Of Hoover: "Hoover was a good man * * * and I like him today. I always thought Mr. Hoover was a better man to be on the team than to be captain."

Of Roosevelt: "He was a highly pleasant man who had programs and could explain them. He had a program and he had the courage to stand by it."

RAYBURN first came into national prominence as chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, when Franklin Roosevelt came in with his New Deal at the depth of the great depression.

RAYBURN looks back on four acts he sponsored as the very cornerstones of the New Deal: the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, the Federal Communications Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act and the Rural Electrification Act.

When, in 1948, he received the Collier's magazine congressional award for distinguished service, a plaque and a check for $10,000 to be used for a public purpose went with it. RAYBURN used it to start building a fund for the SAM RAYBURN Memorial Library in Bonham. Ground was broken in 1955 and the library was dedicated in 1957.

RAYBURN described it as a dream of a lifetime come true. In it are filed all his papers and the volumes of history he loves. You can tell those he's read. At the bottom of page 99 of each one he's inscribed his initials, "S. R." It's RAYBURN's personal bookmark.

A complete set of the records of every Congress is here. Fiction, as such, is strictly relegated to second place.

"You can write a history of the United States without leaving the reading room," RAYBURN says proudly.

AWARD OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS TO SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in Winooski Park, Vt., a week ago today, an honorary degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa, was awarded to one of our colleagues in the Senate. He is a man for whom I have an extremely high regard and a great affection. He is a man who has served in the Senate for 21 years, and who, during that time, has represented his State and his Nation with great ability and distinction. In the words of the citation accompanying the degree awarded to him by St. Michaels College at Winooski Park, Vt.:

We feel fortunate (whoever happens to occupy the White House) that the President must go to such a man for advice and consent.

That is the tribute St. Michael's College paid to "Mr. Vermont," Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, when that veteran public servant was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws at the 58th commencement of that outstanding educational institution. A former commencement speaker and a neighbor of the Society of St. Edmund at Putney, Vt., Senator AIKEN received his degree from St. Michaels' president, Very Reverend Gerald E. Dupont, S.S.E.

I believe that Senator AIKEN is more than "Mr. Vermont." In many respects he has the attributes which entitle him to a far greater title. He is truly all American in what he does. There is nothing sectional about GEORGE AIKEN. He has a great heart and he has a great mind. With these he has one of the greatest attributes of all, commonsense.

GEORGE AIKEN is not only a credit to his State; he is also an outstanding asset to his Nation and one of the great Senators of our time. We in the Senate are pleased and honored that this unassuming, hard-working and dilligent colleague has received such outstanding recognition.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation accompanying the degree awarded the senior Senator from Vermont be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The senior Senator from Vermont needs no introduction to this assembly, for he is "Mr. Vermont" throughout our fair State. It is doubtful if he needs an introduction on any platform in the Nation, since his rare record on the floor of our Senate has made him and his Vermont an image of rugged integrity and sage counsel in the eyes of a respectful country. One might almost say that he has, in his person, distilled the essence of Vermont virtues and saved them from the caricature of well-meaning folklorists—that local offshoot of Madison Avenue advertiser sometimes found growing on the shady side of green mountains. One thinks of Robert Frost as the poet of New England. One always thinks of Senator AIKEN in the same breath with Mr. Frost, as if one man wrote the part and the other enacted it.

His record, from grassroots to national responsibility, is almost too well known to review: Master of the Putney Grange at 18 to ranking minority member of the Senate Agriculture Committee in the flower of his maturity, with a long litany of successes in the steps intervening—town representative in 1931; speaker of the Vermont House in 1933; Lieutenant Governor in 1935; Governor of Vermont from 1937 to 1939; elected to the U.S. Senate in 1940, to which august Chamber he has been returned ever since by overwhelming approval, to serve as member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, as well as Committee on Labor, Public Welfare, Civil Service, Expenditures and Pensions.

Republicans publicly identify him as their progressive spokesman. Democrats privately suggest that he is of their persuasion, spiritually. But they are both right. For Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN is above doctrinaire labels, as the statesman who looks beyond the next election to the next generation is above the politician. We feel fortunate (whoever happens to occupy the White House) that the President must go to such a man for "advice and consent." We feel fortunate that such a man is in our midst to remind today's graduates that there need be no dichotomy between tradition and progress.

Because you, Senator AIKEN, represent the best of both these essentials to our national welfare, we are honored indeed to bestow on you our degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin wishes to be heard. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Six minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 50 minutes remaining; the opponents have 19 minutes.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes of the time of the proponents of the bill to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR THE DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a few minutes today because I find it necessary to voice my protest against the last amendment adopted on the housing bill in the early hours last Friday morning. It was the amendment which empowered the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to small businesses displaced by urban renewal, Federal highway building, and other Government programs. The amendment further raised the rate of interest to be charged for such loans and authorized an increase of $50 million in the funds available to SBA for the disaster loan program.

I want to make my position absolutely clear. I did not oppose the inclusion in the committee bill of the provision for making disaster loans to small businesses displaced by urban renewal programs. The sponsor of the amendment accepted last Friday morning, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], spoke to me about his intention to broaden this provision to include highway programs and also to increase the interest rates so as to cover the cost of the money obtained by the SBA from the Treasury plus administrative expenses. The Senator from Alabama also recalls that he told me of his intention to increase the authorization of funds by $50 million. I have no recollection of that. I do not in any way question the integrity of my good friend from Alabama. We have worked long and hard together for the welfare of small business in this country, and no one has championed that cause for a longer time or with more effectiveness than he has. No one could for a moment question his intentions in trying to aid small businessmen who lose so much in equity and clientele when they are displaced in the upheaval brought about by urban renewal programs.

But Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business, where hearings on this matter were held less than 2 months ago, I know there is absolutely no necessity for increasing the funds which SBA has available for disaster loans. I want to quote from the testimony of Mr. John Horne, the Small Business Administrator, on April 24, before our subcommittee. The total authorization of funds for the disaster loan program stands now at $125 million. I asked Mr. Horne how much was in the disaster loan fund as of the end of March 1961. The answer was $68 million. I then asked what was the greatest amount ever used in any one year from this fund. The answer was that in 1955, the year of the New England floods, SBA had used about $40 million. This means that if, in the next fiscal year, they were called upon to make disaster loans equal to their worst previous year, they would still have a balance in the fund of at least $25 million. Mr. President, I ask that the portion of the testimony of the SBA representatives on this point, in the hearings before the Small Business Subcommittee, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my statement.

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

Senator PROXMIRE. Let us take a look at the disaster loan fund. How much do you have in that? What is the margin you have there?

Mr. HANNA. At the end of March we had a balance of $68 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. What is the greatest amount that you ever used in any one year?

Mr. HANNA. It was approximately $40 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. Never used more than $40 million in disaster in any one full year?

Mr. HANNA. That is approximately correct. That was in 1955, I believe, when we had the floods in New England.

Senator PROXMIRE. So if you take the worst year you have ever had—was what, $47 million?

Mr. HANNA. It was 1955 fiscal year, Senator, I believe.

Senator PROXMIRE. And how much of that was used?

Mr. HANNA. It was the fiscal year 1956 and $44 million was used.

Senator PROXMIRE. Out of an authorization of—

Mr. HANNA. $125 million.

Senator PROXMIRE. An authorization of $125 million.

Mr. HANNA. As a total disaster loan authorization.

Senator PROXMIRE. And you have $67 million left, something like that?

Mr. HANNA. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Unless we have a demand on this disaster fund worse than we have ever had you have an additional leeway there of at least $20 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have subsequently ascertained that while the heaviest drain on the disaster loan fund in any one year was $40 million, the average expenditures from that fund have been approximately $14 million per year. This means that in reality the likelihood is that an amount far greater than $25 million will be in that fund during the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, I realize fully that the amendment adopted provides for a new program that will require more loans. However, I would point out that we have no evidence or experience on which to base an estimate of how much will be loaned. No evidence was offered on the night the amendment was accepted. We do know, however, from the testimony and facts presented by the Small Business Administration itself, that there will be available without further increasing the authorization or appropriation to this fund at least $25 million, and probably closer to $50 million, to put this new program into effect.

What is more, Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senate that the Small Business Administration has asked that all its revolving funds be pooled, so that it can use them where they are most needed when they are most needed. This would mean that from the now segregated funds of the business loan program, the disaster loan program, and the small business investment company loan program, SBA could allocate funds for any of these programs as the need arises.

I believe there is much merit in this proposal; and I have been prepared to give it serious consideration in connection with the small business legislation which is pending this year. It seems to me that it would largely remove the need for increased authorizations for any of the Small Business Administration programs for the next fiscal year.

The amendment to the housing bill accepted last week restricts the increased authorizations to the disaster loan fund. If, however, we subsequently accept SBA's plea for pooling these funds the increase in the disaster loan fund merely becomes a back-door method of increasing their total authorization.

Last week, Mr. President, my staff tried to learn what plans were being made for the amendment which was proposed. They had heard that such an amendment might be forthcoming, but were unable to determine who would offer it or what its exact contents would be.

Therefore, it was with great surprise that I heard it being offered at 1:30 a.m. last Friday morning, at the very end of the housing debate.

In view of what has transpired, Mr. President, I believe Senators should scrutinize very carefully any further proposals in this session, authorizing funds for the Small Business Administration; and it is my intention to exercise such scrutiny with regard to the proposals now before the Small Business Subcommittee.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time yielded to me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me ask how much time the Senator from Virginia desires to have.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Ten minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. BURDICK in the Chair). The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me ask whether the time yielded to the Senator from Virginia is to be charged to the time under the control of the proponents of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the proposed legislation before us, if enacted, would be the eighth omnibus housing bill adopted in the last 13 years. With authority for up to $9.2 billion in housing loans and grants, it would be one of the largest pieces of housing legislation in history. Excluding public housing, the authorizations in this bill alone for existing housing programs almost equal all authorizations ever made by the Congress since the same programs were started.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table showing that all previous housing acts have been in the total amount of $6,420 million; and that the pending bill includes total authorizations of $6,090 million, exclusive of $3 billion-plus for public housing.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, enactment of S. 1922 would commit the Congress in advance to underwrite up to $9 billion in housing loans and grants over many years through either Treasury borrowing authorizations or contract authority.

Both types of authority represent back-door Treasury financing over which the Congress would lose control as to the amount and timing of expenditures. Less than $200 million of this multibillion-dollar bill represents authorizations for appropriations.

Nearly all the bill, in other words, would essentially bypass the normal appropriations process involving annual program reviews. In my opinion, that would not be consistent with the constitutional provision that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

If S. 1922 were enacted, it would increase the budget deficit in the fiscal year 1962 by nearly one-half billion dollars. Even if this bill fails to become law, housing programs already in existence and included in the bill will require an estimated $950 million or so in net budgetary outlays. Since S. 1922 is both excessive and inflationary, I urge that it be rejected.

Let us look at some of the details. The bill would authorize $2.5 billion for urban renewal grants, to last about 4 years.

I may say, though, that we would not have any control over its being spread over 4 years. When we offer money to the cities, we have to pay it once they obligate themselves. We lose control, absolutely, of the sum of $2½ billion, regardless of how difficult it may be for us to finance various essential national projects. This sum, of course, would be used to improve city real estate.

This outlay would more than double the size of the present program.

Up to $3.1 billion would be authorized for annual contributions to be paid until the next century for about 100,000 additional units. The maximum of $3.1 billion would be over and above the $8 billion which the PHA estimates will be paid toward the existing program in future years to supplement nearly $900 million expended through this fiscal year. All this will be used to subsidize housing for only about 1 percent of the Nation's population.

Mr. President, I desire to repeat that. For housing for 1 percent of the population, we have already spent, or will by the end of this fiscal year have spent, about $900 million in annual contributions. We are likely to spend an additional $8 billion over future years for the existing program. And now we are adding up to $3.1 billion for public housing for 1 percent of the population of this Nation.

That is all back-door financing. There is no revolving fund involved, which was the hocus-pocus of the RFC when we started back-door financing. The money is spent in direct violation of the Constitution, which requires appropriations to be passed by Congress. We lose control of the money, because whenever a city obligates itself on units costing $14,000 each, we have to continue those payments.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite an old-fashioned man. Otherwise I would not ask a question like the one I am about to propound, because in the Senate today there is little difference between $4 billion, $5 billion, $12 billion, and $20 billion. The Senate no longer reckons any program in terms of dollars. But I have heard this bill described as involving expenditures of about $6½ billion. Others have said it involves expenditures of $9 billion. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee that reported the bill set me right as to how much is involved? I know it would not make any difference if there were $99 billion involved. The Senate would vote it with a "hurrah."

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can understand the confusion in the distinguished Senator's mind. Even so reliable a news agency as the Associated Press has repeatedly described this as a $6 billion bill, completely ignoring the fact that there is a maximum of $3 billion provided in the bill for public housing. How they can call it a $6 billion bill, I do not know. When we provide for 100,000 public housing units in the bill, and when we obligate the Congress to appropriate a total of $76 million a year for more public housing, estimated to be 100,000 units at $14,000 each, it becomes a nine-plus billion dollar bill. That is contrary to what the news agencies have been freely calling it, a $6 million bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unfortunately, I am so old-fashioned that $9 billion to me still seems to be a considerable amount of money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator can look at the committee report. Nobody on the committee has ever claimed it was solely a $6 billion bill. I do not know who gave the information to the press, but evidently the press service that sent out the stories on it did not read the committee report.

To continue with my statement, under the bill the Federal Government would tend to promote not home saving and homeownership but home borrowing and home spending, nearly all at the expense of greater risk to the Federal Government. Furthermore, portions of the bill would tend to substitute public for private credit, rather than supplement the operations of private lenders. Still other provisions would set up new or expanded programs which would supplant to some degree long-established existing housing programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator need?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield the Senator an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The proposed 40-year, little-equity sales housing program in the bill, despite its amended version, would still make for unsound loans, in my opinion. Currently, so-called moderate income families are now generally eligible for 30-year insured loans under the regular FHA section 203 sales housing program. By extending maturities to 40 years under section 221, the bill would lower the rate at which homeowners save through repaying their mortgages. Using FHA calculations for the depreciated value of a supposedly typical home property—calculations which appear on page 927 of the hearings—even with a 3 percent downpayment on a 40-year 5¼ percent FHA insured loan, the buyer would take more than 5 years to accumulate an equity of as much as 5 percent. That would merely be enough to pay the brokerage fee if the house were sold then. Under this 40-year program, the lower rate of equity buildup in the early years of occupancy would undoubtedly contribute toward a higher rate of mortgage defaults and foreclosures. Both defaults and foreclosures under present programs tend to be greatest during the first 3 or 4 years that loans are outstanding.

Unwise precedents with regard to FHA insurance procedures would be set under several provisions of the bill. FHA would be given discretionary authority under several programs to pay insured claims in the event of default instead of waiting until after foreclosure, as at present. Under one program, FHA would also have the option of paying in cash, or, as at present, in debentures. These precedents would undermine FHA's traditional coinsurance philosophy. Shifting more of the lending risk away from private mortgagees to the Federal Government would encourage unsound lending practices and would increase FHA's need to build up reserves. In one case, the Federal Government could be put directly into the unwelcome business of handling troublesome loans.

These various provisions would establish precedents for turning the entire FHA private insurance type of operation into a public guarantee operation.

I shall not repeat objections I have made elsewhere to the no-equity 20-year home improvement program, the subsidized below-market-rate rental program which would involve indirect Federal lending, and the excessive Federal loan programs in this bill in addition to the FNMA authorization, which total $3.5 billion. Many of these loans would be made under revolving funds which, once established, would not be dependent for their operations upon congressional appropriations.

The excessive long-range commitments in the bill for Federal housing loans and grants would be added to other long-term commitments of even more sizable amounts. To mention only one, $26 billion is outstanding in unused authorizations for various programs to expend from debt receipts; in other words, to engage in one form of Treasury back-door financing. This bill would increase that $26 billion total by over $3.4 billion. These sums exclude, of course, grant programs under contract authority—another variety of back-door financing—such as public housing and urban

renewal, which S. 1922 would increase by as much as $5.6 billion.

Recent new expenditure proposals, such as Federal aid to education, foreign aid, and space exploration, besides many of our existing built-in expenditure programs, suggest a further upward trend in budget outlays. To the extent that deficit financing continues, the inflation which could result would bear heavily upon us all.

S. 1922, with over $3 billion for public housing and $6 billion for other housing programs, is one more step in the direction of further inflation. The cost to the taxpayers of the pending bill would be unnecessarily large. I oppose S. 1922, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

EXHIBIT 1

Program authorizations, S. 1922

[Millions of dollars]

	Type of authority [1]	Program authorizations		
		Previously enacted	Committee bill	Total
FNMA special assistance (Presidential allocation)	BA	950	750	1,700
Loan programs:				
College housing loans	BA	1,675	1,350	3,025
Public facility (including mass transportation) loans	BA	150	150	300
Housing for the elderly loans	AA	50	50	100
VA direct housing loans	BA	1,575	1,200	2,775
Subtotal		3,450	2,750	6,200
Grant programs:				
Urban renewal grants (with $50,000,000 for mass transportation).	CA	2,000	2,500	4,500
Urban planning assistance grants	AA	20	80	100
Public housing: [2]				
Annual contribution	CA	(336)		(336)
Demonstration grants	AA		10	10
Subtotal		2,020	2,590	4,610
Total, housing		6,420	6,090	12,510
Plus Small Business Administration disaster loans to businesses displaced by federally aided construction programs.		125	50	175

[1] BA (Treasury borrowing authorization); CA (contract authority); AA (authorization for appropriations).
[2] The bill would restore $336,000,000 annual contributions authorization contained in the Housing Act of 1949. The current limit on this authorization is $257,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The Senator from Alabama has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me not to exceed 10 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield not to exceed 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words about the housing bill. I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and since I did not participate in the hearings on the bill, I have not entered into the floor discussion.

I am sure that none of us unreservedly supports every provision of this bill. Even the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has admitted that he does not agree with the bill in all particulars.

But let us not forget that the real effect of the measure before us will be simply to extend many of the programs which have given millions of Americans the chance to own their own fine homes, to own a piece of America, or to rent an adequate home or apartment, and which have handed private enterprise a chance for tremendous and profitable expansion.

The principal objections to this bill are the same as the objections we have always heard to housing bills, and they come from the same sources. The main controversy, of course, has centered around title I, because it would establish three new programs of mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing Administration.

Under this title private enterprise would be encouraged to participate to the maximum extent in meeting the housing needs of families whose incomes are too low to now buy or rent respectable private housing, yet who do not qualify for public housing. About one-fourth of the families of the Nation fall into this housing gap—and we have never extended sufficient home-buying opportunity to them.

The program broadens the 40-year, low-interest mortgage insurance program of the FHA. The downpayment requirement would be the same as for families buying higher priced homes. But the 40-year payout period and the lower interest rate would make the monthly payments smaller, and would give people of moderate income an opportunity to buy a good house at a rate they can afford to pay.

I do not agree with the dire charge that the program will endanger the economic soundness of the FHA. It is true that the risk may be greater in the longer term loans. Some families will not stay through the full payout period—some will leave in 2, 3, or 4 years.

But it is plain disregard of facts to talk as though one who has a contract under this title would be free to walk out at any time. The experience with the other programs shows that the houses can be sold again—usually with no loss. And the buyer will have legally obligated himself in the same way as all other buyers; if he is in default, judgment can be secured against him in the courts, and he can be pursued, his wages garnisheed, and other appropriate action taken.

The same charges of unsoundness were also heard when the FHA was established—and it has always paid its own way. These things were said of the GI program. We were told that the GI's were a restless lot; that they had not put down their roots; that they would not take the long contract terms seriously.

None of the predictions have come true. But if they do in the present case, the Congress can and will amend the program before any extensive damage is done. And the bill contains other desirable features.

To my mind, one of the best is that it is moving away from heavily subsidized public housing to less heavily subsidized low-cost private housing. My State of Utah has never felt a need of the public housing program, and has never passed enabling legislation. I believe this new approach will be more valuable to us. And it moves in the direction of more individual ownership and a larger role for private enterprise—things those on the other side of the aisle dearly love to talk about.

I also like the fact that this measure before us will give impetus to the college housing program, which is very popular in my State, and to the housing-for-the-elderly program, which has unchallenged merit.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that this bill will be passed, and with a substantial majority. I also hope that the House will accept title 1 as it is contained in the bill. It is a realistic effort to help moderate- to low-income people acquire housing through private enterprise.

We are proud of our standard of living, of our expanding economy, of our prosperity, of what we like to call our economic progress. Yet what is this progress for, if it is not to give more and more Americans a chance at a better, more comfortable life? I cannot understand the point of view of those who, in the face of the record of the soundness of past housing programs, would deny to this group of our citizens this opportunity to advance themselves.

Mr. President, the bill is being referred to in the newspapers in Utah as the most extravagant housing bill in history. I have a newspaper clipping which states "$9.3 billion will be spent on public housing," and further states "$6.5 billion would be spent on Federal grants for slum clearance, college housing, and other programs."

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SPARKMAN] if it is true that the bill will cost $9.3 billion, and if the money will be spent and will be gone?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at my request the staff of the subcommittee prepared a table to show the total authorizations of this bill and the impact on the budget for the fiscal year 1962. I shall submit this table later on.

The total amount involved in the bill is $6,140 million. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amount includes $2½ billion, spread over a period of years, for urban renewal. It includes $1,350 million, spread over a number of years, for college housing. It includes also $1.2 billion for veterans' direct loans, spread over a period of years, phasing out the veterans' loan program.

I think it is very material that these big individual programs be kept in mind, because these programs contribute so much toward building up to the total of $6,140 million.

Mr. MOSS. Money made available to guarantee loans is money that will eventually be returned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and under the bill $3,550 million would fall in that category.

Mr. MOSS. That amount is money which will be repaid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. It is true, is it not, that during the existence of FHA the Federal Government has not actually lost any money under the loan features of the act?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That experience is true not only with reference to FHA, but also with respect to a good many of the housing programs. I have a table which shows that experience. The net budget expenditures cumulative to June 30, 1960, on all housing programs, including public housing, and excluding only wartime, emergency, and the atomic energy housing, which never were a part of our regular housing program, totaled $5,199,900,000. The Government's equity on all those programs totals $5,696,300,000, which shows a net profit. I ask the Senate to remember that these figures include both public housing and urban renewal, under which program money is expended, and upon which there is no net return.

Over the period of time stated, the net surplus on all the housing programs has been $496,400,000.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. I believe the point he has stated is one we should keep in mind.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator explain the difference between the figure stated by the Senator from Virginia, which was $9,300 million, and the figure stated by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe I can explain the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes of the time of the Senator from Alabama have expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much additional time does the Senator from Utah require?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 additional minutes.

First, the question of the Senator from Ohio concerns the item of public housing, with respect to which there is an authorized annual contribution of $79 million. This figure, however, is always an uncertain one. The figure stated is the maximum, and we never know how much will be used. Past experience has indicated that somewhere in the neighborhood of two-thirds, or 70 or 75 percent of the contract amount is actually expended. If the Senator will compute that amount over a period of 40 years, he will arrive at the difference between the figures he suggested. I believe the Senator from Virginia explained that point in his statement.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator. The point I wish to make is that instead of spending vast amounts of money, as is charged, we would really make an amount of credit available. The money is returned to the Federal Treasury. We do not spend the money; we merely guarantee loans on housing. I believe it has been one of the great programs of America.

I congratulate the Senator from Alabama for his leadership in connection with the bill now before the Senate, which I hope will be passed this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator from Florida desire?

Mr. HOLLAND. Twelve minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that the time was to be yielded by the other side. I do not wish to take the time of the Senator from Alabama, since I shall oppose his position.

Mr. ALLOTT. On behalf of the minority leader, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since I shall vote against S. 1922, as amended—the Housing bill which is now before the Senate for final passage—I feel that it is appropriate to state for the record the principal provisions which, in my judgment, are so unwise, extravagant and indefensible that I feel dutybound to oppose the passage of the measure. Before doing so, however, may I state briefly that I feel that the Senate, by its action on many of the amendments proposed, has either improved the bill from the form in which it came from the committee, or else has rejected addition to the bill of provisions which, to me, would have made the measure even more intolerable.

Among the amendments adopted by the Senate during debate which I think improved the bill are the following:

First. The amendment eliminating the extremely ultraliberal provision of the bill which for 2 years would have required from moderate income families no downpayment whatever on 40-year loans for single-unit houses of not to exceed $15,000 in value. In my judgment, this no-downpayment proposal—which no Senator would have permitted if he were making a private investment of his own capital—which differed so greatly from any former provisions of the housing program throughout the years of its existence, was thoroughly impractical and even socialistic. It would have resulted in giving unjustified preference to a large number of citizens who would have secured this type of loan within the next 2 years on terms which would have not only discouraged thrift, pride of homeownership, and independence, but would also have discriminated heavily against hundreds of thousands of other citizens in the same income bracket who have acquired their homes under the standard FHA program at existing rates of interest and on a 30-year basis or less.

Second. The amendment striking from the bill the proposed $100 million to assist unnamed cities in purchasing open space through back-door Treasury financing. This action wisely eliminated a potentially vast new field of spending and one in which political favoritism was invited.

Third. The amendment barring public housing authorities and other public agencies from participating in the multiple-unit, no-downpayment, 40-year, 3⅛-percent interest feature of the bill.

In addition to the three amendments just mentioned and other helpful ones, the Senate wisely rejected several amendments which would have made the bill even worse, in my opinion, two of which I mention:

First. Since the allocation of the urban renewal program among the several States was not changed, the amendment providing that the Federal Government should contribute three-fourths, rather than the standard two-thirds, of the cost of urban renewal in cities under 150,000 in distressed areas would have penalized the larger cities of over 150,000 in the same States, as well as those cities under 150,000 which were not classified as distressed areas.

Second. The amendment extending the Veterans' Administration direct Federal loan privilege to veterans in cities and all other areas throughout the Nation could have placed the Government in direct competition with all commercial lending agencies instead of confining said direct loans, as always heretofore, to those rural areas where the commercial agencies do not extend their lending activities.

There are, of course, some good features in this omnibus bill which time does not permit me to mention. Some of these I would gladly support if they were separated from the extremely extravagant provisions which I cannot approve. There are also more bad features than I am able to list in my limited time, though I do wish to mention at this time four of said features which I regard as especially bad:

First. One of the worst features of the bill is that it extends full Federal insurance to housing loans for moderate income families for either new or rehabilitated multiunit housing at an interest rate of 3⅛ percent for 40 years and without any downpayment. In my judgment, this will result in the construction or rehabilitation of many substandard apartments or tenements which fail by a great deal to realize the national purpose, which is to help American families to secure adequate homes. Such a provision discourages thrift, encourages irresponsibility, and will result

in the Nation having to ultimately acquire a large part of such undesirable housing at great loss and without accomplishing the desired purpose. This will extend to many millions the present no-equity program which was designed to serve a relatively few families which have a strong moral claim on our Government by reason of their having been displaced by urban renewal or other public action.

The laudable purpose of those Senators who supported this program was to serve what they call moderate income families, which term is not described in the bill, though it is stated in the debate to cover families of income from $4,000 to $6,000 per year. When one looks at the hundreds of thousands of modest attractive homes which have been purchased by families in this same income bracket throughout our Nation under standard FHA procedure, by thriftily saving their money and making the small downpayment, and agreeing to pay interest rates for up to 30 years at prevailing rates, I cannot help but wonder how these millions of good citizens will feel when they realize that under the so-called experimental program incorporated in this bill many thousands of other families will be allowed, in the next 2 years, to secure living quarters by agreeing to pay 3⅛ percent interest for 40-year terms, without downpayment, in the case of multiple unit homes.

Second. The bill would add to the urban renewal program $2.5 billion of additional Federal grants, which would more than double the size of the existing program to a total of $4.5 billion. To make bad matters worse, this $2.5 billion additional program would take the form of contract authority, which is a type of back-door Treasury financing, in which Congress loses control.

Third. This bill would also authorize approximately 100,000 units of public housing which would cost $3.1 billion in Federal grants and commit us to a heavy added program for the next 40 years. This, too would be financed by back-door methods, which would supply subsidized housing to a relatively few families throughout the Nation at the expense of all taxpayers. Already, in fiscal 1961, more than $151 million will be required on the existing public housing program.

Fourth. One of the most objectionable features of the bill, to me, is that it will provide $50 million for use at the sole discretion of the Administrator of HHFA, to be used as grants to unnamed cities, of his selection, to make experiments in mass transportation demonstration projects. One could hardly conceive of a program more susceptible of political misuse than this, which, by the way, has no direct connection whatever with housing.

Mr. President, I shall summarize the meaning of this bill, in tax dollars, to the overburdened taxpayers of our Nation at a time when we are trying to fight off further inflation and concentrate our efforts and our expenditures in solving extremely critical international problems involving our security and, possibly, our very existence. I feel that I should state the totals of loans and grants of Federal money to which this bill will commit the American people.

As to loans, this will commit us to lend over $3.5 billion; that is, to make expenditures in the total amount of over $3.5 billion in the near future on a basis of hoped for repayment over a period of many years, some of the loans being repayable over periods of as many as 40 years. As to grants, this bill will commit our Nation to a total of $2.64 billion in grants without considering our grants for public housing, which will add a total of $3.1 billion in grants for that purpose, with the possibility of some small reduction in this huge schedule of grants for public housing.

I may say on that matter that on inquiry of the able staff of the committee, I have been informed that what they were hoping for was that the 100 percent grants would be reduced on the average to about 85 percent.

The stark fact is that this bill will commit us to approximately $9.3 billion in additional Federal loans and grants for housing without figuring the contingent liability which will accrue from the huge total of Federal insurance which will be issued on all phases of the insured housing loan program, and this liability should give more concern as our lending programs become more liberal and less sound.

I am not prepared to vote for this huge addition to our national financial burden and I doubt whether any considerable portion of the American people, if they knew the facts, would want us to go into this vast undertaking at a time when the Nation is already carrying such heavy burdens and is confronted with the necessity of assuming an immense additional load in the near future for the purpose of assuring our defense and our continued existence.

Mr. President, I wish that I could feel there were a real chance of our defeating this extremely bad bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Federal Government of the United States has been subsidizing or underwriting the housing industry and its allied activities for more than 25 years.

Through last June 30 a gross total of $115 billion in Federal appropriations, and credit of the United States, had been used for this purpose. Subsidies in the current year will bring the total to nearly $120 billion.

Yet, the committee report on the pending bill, S. 1922, would have us believe that the situation is worse now than it was when Federal housing programs were started; and from observation, audits by the Comptroller General, and analysis of the numerous so-called housing bills, I should not be surprised if this were true.

I regard the so-called housing bill now before the Senate as the worst bill on this subject ever proposed during the more than a quarter of a century of legislation in this field.

It embraces all of the objectionable features in both of the housing bills of 1959 which were vetoed by the President; in fact this bill goes far beyond those proposals.

In his message of July 7, 1959, vetoing S. 57 of the 86th Congress, the President said in part:

> 1. The bill is extravagant and much of the spending it authorizes is unnecessary.
> 2. The bill is inflationary.
> 3. The bill would tend to substitute Federal spending for private investment.
> 4. The bill contains provisions which would impair FHA's soundness.

In his message of September 4, 1959, vetoing the second housing bill of that year, the President said:

> At a time when critical national needs heavily burden Federal finances, this bill would start new programs, certain to cost huge sums in the future, under which taxpayers' money would be loaned, at subsidized interest rates, for purposes that could be better met by other methods.

I wish to be recorded as opposing the pending bill for at least 20 reasons:

First. The bill would authorize $3,450 million in back-door spending, through expenditures from the Federal debt.

Second. It would authorize $2,600 million in side-door spending, through contract authorizations.

Third. The bill would authorize direct appropriations totaling $140 million for expenditure in specified programs, plus open-end appropriation authorizations of "amounts necessary" to cover expenses and losses in at least two new programs.

Fourth. It would remove the dollar ceiling, and leave without limit, FHA authority to insure general housing mortgages.

Fifth. The bill would set up three new programs of so-called grants-in-aid to States and localities, in addition to the 60-odd programs through which the Federal Government is already spending more than $7 billion. Those who are lured into the trap of thinking Federal grants do not come from their own pocketbooks forget there is no other source of Federal revenue.

Sixth. The bill would establish a whole series of unsound financing arrangements under provisions designed to use FHA mortgage insurance not only for new construction but also for repair and rehabilitation of old structures.

Seventh. The bill would permit the purchase of low and moderate cost housing with 100 percent, FHA-insured, 40-year mortgages with no downpayment.

Eighth. For some rental housing the bill would authorize the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages indefinitely, in excess of 40 years.

Ninth. The bill would provide additional Federal subsidy for rental housing under provisions permitting FHA insurance of mortgages bearing interest below the market rate.

Tenth. The bill also authorizes the FHA Commissioner to control the rents and operations in some of these projects

constructed with mortgages bearing interest below the market rate.

Eleventh. Under terms of the bill the FHA insured mortgages on big multifamily rental projects could be increased to pay for losses incurred during the first 2 years of operation.

Twelfth. The solvency of FHA would be impaired further by provisions authorizing the FHA Commissioner to reduce insurance premiums, and in some cases to waive them entirely.

Thirteenth. The bill would permit FHA insurance on at least two new programs under which projects would be specifically exempt from the test of economic soundness.

Fourteenth. It would also permit FHA insurance, with little or no security, of loans for extensive home improvement and repair as high as $10,000 per unit for 25 years.

Fifteenth. The bill would permit FHA insurance of mortgages for experimental housing, and authorize the FHA Commissioner to spend available funds as necessary to correct defects and failures.

Sixteenth. The bill would authorize FNMA to spend an additional three-quarters of a billion dollars out of the Federal debt for purposes of buying up poor risk mortgages under existing programs as well as new programs provided in the bill.

Seventeenth. The bill would pledge the full faith and credit of the Federal Government as security for local debt contracted pursuant to urban renewal agreements.

Eighteenth. It would open up vast new areas for Federal so-called assistance in urban areas, including mass transportation and open spaces.

Nineteenth. The bill would go through the useless procedure of extending the Capehart military housing program for another year. The Senate has already rejected this program in the military construction bill.

Twentieth. General housing programs have always been characterized by loose legislation, and over the years the HHFA Administrator and the FHA Commissioner have been given more and more discretionary powers. This bill contains 89 pages, and there are at least 102 provisions giving additional discretionary power to these Federal housing bureaucrats. I reject the idea of Federal czars over the housing industry and allied activities in the United States.

These 20 objectionable features in the pending bill constitute good and sufficient reason to oppose the bill. There are more; they become obvious as we analyze the bill. I ask unanimous consent to have such an analysis inserted in the RECORD, at this point, as part of my remarks.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD, following this analysis, first, a tabular presentation of authorizations for Federal expenditures and use of public credit contained in the bill, and second, a tabular presentation entitled "Summary of Public Credit and Money (Gross) Used Under Federal Housing and Related Programs, 1933 to June 30, 1960."

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

ANALYSIS OF HOUSING ACT OF 1961 (S. 1922)

TITLE I—NEW HOUSING PROGRAMS

Section 101 establishes new FHA insurance program for low and moderate income families and displaced families by rewriting the old FHA section 221 housing insurance program. Designed to assist private industry in providing housing for these groups, the program is described by the committee as experimental and as a new and untried approach. The bill does not define moderate income. This liberalized program, which the committee itself suggests should be reviewed in 2 years, would provide housing generally in three ways:

1. Sales housing (1–4 family)—market rate: 40-year, no-downpayment, 100 percent mortgages for new construction up to $38,000; and similar mortgages to cover full cost of repair, rehabilitation and refinancing of existing structures. Such mortgages insured at going market rate of interest not over 6 percent.

2. Rental housing (5 or more units)—market rate: 90 percent mortgages up to $12.5 million for new construction; and similar mortgages to cover 90 percent of cost of repair, rehabilitation and refinancing of existing structures. Term of mortgages would be prescribed by the FHA Commissioner, and could exceed 40 years, at going market rate of interest not over 6 percent.

Below market rate: New program of insurance for mortgages bearing interest below going market rate, sponsored by nonprofit organizations, limited dividend corporations, public bodies or agencies, or cooperatives. Mortgage insurance up to 100 percent, up to $12.5 million for new construction; and similar insurance for repair, rehabilitation and refinancing of existing structures. FHA Commissioner, at his discretion, would be authorized to:

(a) Approve reduced interest rate to a minimum of the average on U.S. marketable obligations (presently about 3⅛);

(b) Eliminate FHA insurance premium, reduce it, or impose a premium charge for part of life of mortgage;

(c) Establish and enforce maximum rentals and certain management practices.

Further, such mortgages would be eligible for purchase by FNMA under its special assistance functions, and the report acknowledges they would probably be held in the FNMA portfolio. FNMA would be authorized to buy up such mortgages on projects sponsored by governmental instrumentalities. Appropriations would be authorized to reimburse FHA for any expenses and net losses sustained.

Section 102 establishes new FHA general mortgage insurance program for home improvement and repair loans, both within and outside urban renewal areas. The program is designed to provide financing for the more extensive home repairs that cannot be financed under the FHA title I home improvement program. Such loans could be insured up to $10,000 up to 25 years, per family unit. Outside urban renewal area 1–4 family structures only are covered; inside urban renewal area there is no such limitation. Some other significant points include:

1. Eligible borrowers may include long-term lessees.

2. Test of economic soundness need not be met for loans within urban renewal areas; outside urban renewal areas economic test may be waived in so-called gray areas where HHFA approves community rehabilitation plans, according to committee report.

3. Committee contemplates insurance on loans with no security other than signature, except in cases of larger, long-term loans where the FHA Commissioner may require adequate security. Adequate security is not defined, except that committee suggests cosigner pledge of future annuities, etc.; or the lien shall be junior if the property is security.

4. As special inducement to lenders, loans are made eligible for purchase by FNMA. In case of properties in urban renewal areas, loans would be purchased under FNMA special assistance authorization.

Section 103 establishes new FHA insurance program for mortgages on experimental housing projects, both sales and rental. Program contemplates projects involving advance designs and technology, new and untried materials, etc. Projects would not have to meet the economically sound requirement, but at FHA Commissioner's discretion may be acceptable risk. Bill authorizes FHA Commissioner to expend available funds to correct any defects or failures caused by use of advanced techniques under this program; and FHA would be authorized to make investigations, reports, analyses, etc., relative to use of these advanced techniques.

Section 104 establishes new FHA program to permit mortgage insurance for individual ownership (outright or long-term leasehold) of family units in FHA insured multifamily structures (except 213 co-ops). Mortgage would include undivided interest in the common areas and building facilities, and the FHA Commissioner would be authorized to take whatever steps he determines to be necessary to protect owners and other occupants of the structures. This so-called condominium insurance could run from 70 percent to 97 percent of the appraised value of the unit, depending on the value, and an individual would be allowed mortgage insurance for the purchase of up to 4 such units. The bill would leave to the discretion of the FHA Commissioner the terms and conditions of the mortgages, and it is not clear as to the length of time they may run, nor is it clear what other terms and safeguards would be prescribed.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS AND LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Housing for the elderly

Section 201 amends the existing direct loan program (98 percent, 50-year 3½-percent loans to private nonprofit organizations), to extend it to include projects sponsored by public bodies or agencies and consumer cooperatives. The bill would increase the authorization for appropriations from $50 million to $100 million, and would remove the present limitation of $5 million on the amount which may be used for related facilities. The committee expects this will result in increased use of program, and facilitate administration.

Public housing

Section 202 removes requirement from existing law that disabled persons be at least 50 years of age, and substitutes no age limits.

Section 203 directs HHFA Administrator and PHA Commissioner to encourage the acquisition and repair, rehabilitation or remodeling of existing structures for low-rent housing, rather than new construction, wherever possible.

Section 204 authorizes additional low-rent subsidy of up to $120 a year for each dwelling unit occupied by elderly families. Federal annual contributions would be increased accordingly as necessary to keep the project solvent.

Section 205 authorizes the PHA to contract for additional public housing units, approximately 100,000, up to the limit of the existing PHA authorization to make annual contributions ($336 million). The section would alter the limitation on the number of units to 15 percent per State on the basis of the

remaining balance of units (rather than 15 percent of total units), for new commitments.

Section 206 eliminates existing Federal law which prescribes in detail standards for tenant eligibility and preference. The substitute language would, as the report says, "create greater flexibility in the public housing program by requiring greater responsibility for administering the program at the local level." The bill provides that:

1. The local public agency shall set income limits for occupancy, with prior approval by PHA;

2. The local public agency shall set its own policies and priorities for admission, as the report says, "in such a way as to best meet * * * particular local problems;" and

3. Allow local public agencies to permit over-income tenants if they pay "appropriate rent" and are unable to find other suitable housing.

Section 207 authorizes appropriations of $10 million for grants to public or private bodies or agencies, to "explore and demonstrate the effectiveness and feasibility of any new or untried ideas" with respect to "housing and a suitable living environment for low-income persons and families." The bill is not specific as to the nature of the grants, but the report lists several of the "interesting possibilities," including direct payments to low-income families, social services, etc.

Secton 208 increases the per room limitation for Alaska public housing and units designated for elderly persons from $2,500 to $3,000.

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL AND PLANNING

Section 301 permits pooling of local noncash grant-in-aid credits earned in projects assisted under both the two-thirds and three-fourths formulas for Federal grants. This provision is obscure, but Committee reports says, "The adoption of this section should encourage more localities to adopt the alternative three-fourths capital grant formula, which reduces Federal supervision and paperwork that now add to the Government's administrative costs."

Section 302 pledges the full faith and credit of the Federal Government as security for local public agency borrowings from the public, where such borrowings are secured by a Federal loan contract.

Section 303 increases capital grant authorization by $2.5 billion from $2 billion to $4.5 billion. It would reserve $50 million of this for use in making grants for mass transportation demonstration projects, although such projects need not be part of the urban renewal project.

Section 304 authorizes local public agencies to make relocation payments in excess of the present maximums of $200 per family and $3,000 per business, providing the local agency bears one-third of the increased payment as a part of project costs.

Section 304 makes business concerns displaced by urban renewal activities eligible for loans under the Small Business Act on the same liberal terms as catastrophe loans. Committee report notes that additional authorization will have to be made to the Small Business Administration for this purpose.

Section 306 increases the capital grant reserve fund from $100 million to $150 million, having the effect of raising the per State limitation for the benefit of States with larger demands for projects.

Section 307 authorizes the sale of urban renewal property to developers of low and moderate income housing projects, at prices which would encourage construction and rehabilitation of this type of housing. The section would further authorize the sale of urban renewal property for public housing purposes at reduced prices.

Section 308 establishes a new rehabilitation demonstration program, which would permit the local public agency to acquire and improve properties within the renewal area for demonstration and experiment purposes, and for resale to private owners.

Section 309 allows 30 percent of the new urban renewal grant authority to be used for nonresidential purposes, instead of present 20 percent limitation.

Section 310 allows urban renewal projects to claim credit for hospital expenditures within the area, as well as college and university expenditures, in computing the local noncash contribution. Allowance also would be made for costs of rehabilitation.

Section 311 increases the Federal share of urban planning assistance grants from one-half to two-thirds, and increases the authorizations for appropriations from $20 million to $100 million. Program would be extended to include highway and mass transportation planning, and provide for assistance to interstate planning agencies.

Section 312 allows donation of approximately 1 acre of land in Knoxville, Tenn., for historical purposes; section 313 would permit construction costs of a certain school in Roanoke, Va., to be counted as local noncash contribution to the local urban renewal project; and section 314 would be primarily technical.

TITLE IV—COLLEGE HOUSING, COMMUNITY FACILITIES, AND MASS TRANSPORTATION

College housing loans

Section 401 increases debt authority by $1,350 million to $3,025 million over a period of 5 years as follows: $100 million upon enactment, and $250 million a year for the 5 fiscal years 1962 through 1966. The limitations on loans for "other educational facilities" and "student nurse and intern housing" would be increased by $25 million each. The per State limitation of 10 percent would be increased to 12½ percent of the total loan authority to make more funds available for certain States making the greatest use of the program.

Public facility and mass transportation loans

Section 402 expands the present public facility loan program to include mass transportation in urban areas. The revolving fund for loans would be increased from $150 million to $300 million, of which $100 million would be earmarked for mass transportation loans. Interest on mass transportation loans would be the average Treasury rate on interest-bearing obligations in the debt (presently 3½ percent), the same low rate allowed for college housing.

Section 403 increases the per State limitation on interest-free public works planning advances from 10 percent to 12½ percent of funds available (for the benefit of certain States making greater use of the program), and would allow longer term planning.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

FNMA special assistance authorization

Section 501 increases FNMA "special assistance" authorization to purchase certain special types of mortgages, at the discretion of the President, from $950 million to $1.7 billion. Other sections of the bill qualify the new FHA insurance programs (for low and moderate income housing and home improvement loans) for purchase under this authority to support mortgages which are not "economically sound."

Section 502 allows purchase by FNMA of section 213 co-op housing mortgages in urban renewal areas in excess of the present $17,500 per family unit limitation.

FHA insurance programs

Section 503 contains provision with respect to FHA insurance which would:

1. extend present title I home improvement loan program for 2 years through October 1, 1963;

2. remove dollar ceiling from FHA general insurance authority, and set expiration date at October 1, 1965. (The report makes it clear the committee does not intend to "eliminate FHA or permit the expiration date to pass without further extension.")

3. extend Capehart military housing program until October 1, 1962, and authorize an additional 12,000 units.

Section 504 authorizes FHA Commissioner, at his discretion, to reduce the FHA insurance premium (presently ½ of 1 percent) on all title II insurance programs. This would include all FHA insurance programs except military and defense housing and title I home improvement loans.

Section 505 amends the big section 207 FHA multifamily rental program to permit "any mortgagor approved by the Commissioner" (including individuals) to be a sponsor; and provide that "exterior land improvements" could be excluded in determining the maximum mortgage amount.

Section 506 amends the section 213 cooperative housing insurance program to allow "exterior land improvements" to be excluded from the per room limitations in determining maximum amount of mortgage; reduce from 8 to 5 the minimum number of units in a project; permit approval of "blacklisted" sponsors; and allow "supplemental financing" to repair and improve projects, or provide additional community facilities.

Section 507 allows net losses in first 2 years of operation of any FHA-insured multifamily project to be added to the amount of the insured mortgage.

Section 508 allows mortgage insurance for nursing homes up to 90 percent of replacement cost for new construction or value in case of existing structure. Present mortgage maximum is 75 percent of value.

Technical and conforming amendments

Section 509 contains numerous provisions which the report describes as "technical and conforming". Without going into detail, these amendments appear to extend some of the liberalized features in the proposed new programs to the existing ones, and to make certain existing provisions apply to the proposed new programs.

TITLE VI—OPEN SPACE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Section 601 sets forth the purposes of the title, as follows: "to help curb urban sprawl and prevent spread of blight, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development, and to help provide recreational, conservation, and scenic areas by assisting preservation of open-space land."

Section 602 establishes a new $100 million Federal program of grants to States and local public bodies to assist in land acquisition, with Federal share ranging up to 35 percent.

Section 603 sets forth in broad generalities the planning requirements which must be met for approval, and directs HHFA Administrator to take appropriate action "to assure that local governing bodies are preserving a maximum of open space land."

Section 604 prohibits use of assisted open-space land for any other purpose without approval of HHFA Administrator.

Section 605 authorizes additional appropriations for technical assistance, studies, and publication of information.

Section 606 defines, for purposes of the program, the terms "open-space land," "urban area," and "State."

TITLE VII—OTHER HOUSING PROGRAMS

Farm housing

Section 701 extends the farm housing program for 5 years until June 30, 1966, and would allow wider latitude in type of security the borrower must provide in order to obtain a loan.

Home improvement loans

Sections 702 and 703 amend the Homeowners Loan Act and the Federal Reserve Act, to allow savings and loan associations and national banks to make loans under the

new FHA-insured home improvement loan program proposed in this bill, notwithstanding the fact that loans would not be insured by first mortgages.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program

Section 704 extends voluntary home mortgage credit program until October 1, 1965.

Lanham Act housing

Section 705 extends for 1 year the period for which the Passyunk war housing project in Philadelphia may be occupied by military and civilian personnel employed in defense activities.

Veterans' direct home-loan program

Section 706 raises the maximum amount of veterans' direct home loan from $13,500 to $15,000, and would establish the time limit for eligibility at 10 years from date of discharge plus 1 year for each 4 months' service. The section would extend program to July 25, 1967, for World War II veterans and until January 31, 1975, for Korean war veterans, and would authorize additional borrowings from the debt totaling $1,200 million over a period of 7 years.

Administrative

Section 707 authorizes HHFA Administrator and the heads of constituent agencies to use salary and expense money to purchase publications, subscriptions, and membership in organizations to receive publications.

Authorizations in Housing Act of 1961 (S. 1922)

[In millions]

	Appropriations	Authorizations to spend from public debt	Contract authorizations	Authority to insure	Total
Federal Housing Administration:					
General insurance authority (remove dollar ceiling)				(1)	(1)
Sec. 221 housing insurance fund (authorizes appropriations for net losses in connection with "below market rate" rental housing insurance program)	(2)				(2)
Housing for the elderly: Direct loans (authorization increased from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000)	$50				$50
Public Housing Administration: Demonstration program—grants to public or private bodies	10				10
Urban renewal:					
Capital grants (authorization increased from $2,000,000,000 to $4,500,000,000) (including $50,000,000 for mass transportation)			$2,500		2,500
Urban planning assistance (authorization increased from $20,000,000 to $100,000,000)	80				80
College housing: Direct loans (authorization increased over 5-year period from $1,675,000,000 to $3,025,000,000):					
Fiscal year 1961 (upon enactment)		$100			100
Fiscal year 1962		250			250
Fiscal year 1963		250			250
Fiscal year 1964		250			250
Fiscal year 1965		250			250
Fiscal year 1966		250			250
Community facilities: Direct loans (authorization increased from $150,000,000 to $300,000,000):					
Community facility loans		50			50
Mass transportation loans		100			100
Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions—Presidential authorization (authorization increased from $950,000,000 to $1,700,000,000)		750			750
Open space and urban development:					
Grants to States and local public bodies			100		100
Technical assistance, studies and publication of information	(2)				(2)
Farm housing: Direct loans (authority extended 5 years; balance of approximately $200,000,000 continued available)					
Veterans' Administration: Direct housing loans (authorization increased over 6-year period from $1,575,000,000 to $2,775,000,000):					
Fiscal year 1961 (upon enactment)		100			100
Fiscal year 1962		400			400
Fiscal year 1963		200			200
Fiscal year 1964		150			150
Fiscal year 1965		150			150
Fiscal year 1966		100			100
Fiscal year 1967		100			100
Total	140	3,450	2,600	(1)	6,190

[1] No limit. [2] Amounts necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it appears that I will not be present when the Senate votes on the pending bill. I have an engagement to be in Akron, Ohio, tonight at 8 o'clock, to deliver a commencement address, and therefore I wish to place myself on record concerning the merits of the pending bill. I will not vote for it. There are aspects of it to which I can subscribe. There are others against which I voiced my protest last week. They are unsound. Several issues were voted upon last week, which I opposed, and on which I was on the losing side. They have led me to the conclusion that, although there are some parts of the bill which I would approve, I nevertheless cannot cast my vote for the entire bill.

Some phases of these new programs are, in my judgment, economically unsound. The $50 million proposal, supposedly provided to make studies to solve urban commuter problems, is, I think, completely unjustified. There is no delineation of how the money will be spent. It is to be a blank check with no understanding of how the $50 million will be used. It may be said that $50 million is not much, but I simply cannot consider the proposal in that way.

I shall vote against the bill. If I am not present at the time of the vote, I hope some arrangement will be made to secure a pair for me. I will try to be present for the vote if the debate is concluded at an early time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, due to the limitation of time, I shall be brief in giving my reasons for opposing the enactment of the housing bill, which provides a program involving more than $9 billion, mostly on credit and on greatly deferred payments.

Parenthetically, I especially wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who was ably assisted by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], in the argument they made a few days ago with respect to the amendment to strike out the 40-year, no-down-payment provision. Their arguments were sound and were presented in the finest way. I spent 19 years in the trial courtroom too. Considering the argumentative weapons which he had at his command, the response of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has most ably handled this bill, was one of the best responses I ever heard, thus showing that good debate still has a place on the Senate floor. I wish we had more of it.

Mr. President, I am not willing to put the costs of our times, real or imaginary, on the backs of generations to come, rather than on our own. This is exactly what the present housing bill program, as well as many other Federal programs, is doing, chiefly through back-door and side-door financing, which avoids appropriations by Congress and postpones payday. Nevertheless, as certain as night follows day, someone will have to pay, and with compound interest.

I am willing to vote to increase taxes to meet the real demands of our times, including some housing, if that is actually necessary. My voting record over the years proves this. However, I am not willing that we who are living now should reap the benefits of all this free spending, and then pass the burden

thereof to the next generation for the payment of the bills.

Rapidly growing numbers of Government programs of one kind or another are making our people dependent on the Government. The number of Government employees is growing rapidly all over the Nation. People are becoming more and more dependent on the Government, under one guise or another, to solve all the problems of our age. Public housing and privately owned but Government-financed housing, on extremely liberal terms, come to mind as a part of this rapidly growing picture.

This leads me to the thought that possibly within a few decades almost all of our people will be either employed by the Government or subsidized by the Government. This came forcefully to me recently during the morning traffic hours, when I observed thousands of people crossing the streets of Washington on their way to work in the departments of the Government. At the same moment, a large delivery van, marked "Sears, Roebuck & Co.," rushed by. This gave me the added realization that if big business continues to grow bigger, then within the same few decades the only private businesses left will be the huge national and international corporations. By then, the "little fellow" will be out of the way.

I had rather that we go slower on some things and retain the solid foundations of personal independence and individual opportunity to develop. We are traveling down a road which will lead us to total dependence on the Government.

Somewhere along the way, I believe the commonsense of the American people will assert itself, that they will reverse this trend, and thus find their way back.

I do not expect to change any votes by these remarks; I simply wish to leave a few benchmarks. What I say may serve as a benchmark to help some future generation find its way back to individual independence and initiative, which is a law of nature and a law of God, and was the intended foundation of our form of government.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, how much time remains for the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The opponents have 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, how much time remains for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I yield myself 1 additional minute from this side.

Madam President, like the Senator from Mississippi, I feel that I must leave a benchmark as to my feelings upon the housing bill. I feel strongly that the United States is pursuing a fiscal policy which cannot be justified in the light of the world situation. I cannot justify a 40-year program and the interest-subsidy program in connection with multiple housing units. I cannot justify the huge sum placed in urban renewal. I think we should begin to ask ourselves, considering the growth of the program, whether contributions by the Federal Government are not in fact in and of themselves encouraging to move toward more and more Federal aid for urban renewal.

Why should the city worry about slums being created if the Federal Government is standing by to pick up half the tab for the area's renewal and rehabilitation.

I shall have to oppose the bill because I do not believe that 100,000 units of public housing are needed or that there is any possibility that they will be built this year.

I am opposed to the bill because I cannot see the necessity of placing $50 million in grants in various cities for the purpose of transportation studies. Transportation does not belong in the housing bill. One of the justifications made for this purpose the other evening was the development of the monorail.

I stated at that time that a monorail system has been in operation in Germany for 40 years. Probably very few persons who are concerned with transportation studies have bothered to look at it.

There is nothing new in this phase of the transportation field. The only thing the District of Columbia has been able to suggest by way of new transportation facilities, after spending almost half a million dollars on investigations, is a subway system, something which has been known in this country for almost 100 years.

So, Madam President, while the bill contains provisions which I heartily approve—I do approve of the regular FHA program and of the college housing program—still when the package is presented to me upon a take-it-or-leave-it basis, the only means I have, as a Senator, of expressing my disapproval of some of the proposals—and I express my disapproval strongly—is by voting against the bill. That I shall do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, how does the time stand at present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 2 minutes remaining; the proponents have 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, I shall vote against the housing bill. I supported every amendment which would curtail or lessen the burden of expenditures. There are many reasons why I shall vote against the bill. I do not believe that socialism is a good thing in America. I am unable to find any reason why some citizens should be taxed to provide houses for other citizens, assuming that the other citizens are completely able to buy houses.

There are a few items in the bill which are excepted, and which do not lead to Government or public ownership of houses. I refer to the traditional FHA program, which I support.

The bill is far too expensive. It moves in a direction of greater dependence upon government. It moves in the direction of nationalized housing, just as we are moving in the direction of nationalized education and a destruction of the individual in our federal system of sovereign States within the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to have additional time?

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to have 1 minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, the United States has many demands upon it in the world struggle against communism. All around us, things are not only crumbling and deteriorating, but the demands made on the United States are becoming greater. The demands made upon the United States in the field of our own defense are becoming greater. It is time that we follow the admonition of the President of the United States in his inaugural address, when he said, in substance, that now is the time, not to ask what our country can do for us, but to ask, "What can I do for my country?"

Madam President, I propose a moratorium on all these new Government social programs, until our budget is in balance and until our country is secure against the Communist threat.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging to the time available to either side the time required for the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, may I be advised again how much time remains available to our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 11 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator from Indiana desire?

Mr. CAPEHART. One minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared on the housing bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

As I have stated previously during committee and floor debate on the housing bill, I have never voted against an omnibus housing bill in the 17 years I have been in the Senate.

However, I am going to break that record today.

In all of the 17 years I have worked for housing legislation, I have truthfully found all those with whom I have worked on both sides of the aisle sincere in their efforts to effect a housing program sufficient to meet the needs of those who need housing assistance from their Government.

In fact, I found it necessary on occasion to take a position on housing legislation that was contrary to the position taken by my own party's administration when I did not think that administration's position fully met the needs.

By the same token, I opposed the overall demands of this administration's housing bill because it goes far beyond what I sincerely believe to be the needs.

I faced up to the criticisms of my position before and I will face up to the criticisms of my position now. I was belabored in the debate on the housing bill when my party was the sponsor and I have been belabored on this bill sponsored by the opposition party.

Efforts by a few individuals to attach a charge of inconsistency to my policies on housing have been reduced to pure misrepresentation by the record.

I have grave fears that the housing program in this country will eventually be destroyed by the constant pressure to make it the catchall basin for ultraliberal ideas that so often are developed in times of false panic.

During my 17-year record on housing I have fathered a few new ideas, some of which my good friends classified then as liberal. I have always supported sufficient public housing to meet whatever numbers the cities wanted to sponsor.

In fact, I was the author of the first bill which carried the term of urban renewal. I am proud that my name is attached to a military housing program which is definitely a liberal approach by the Government to help its military personnel to have decent housing.

Countless other features in the complex housing program have had my support as they were brought before us in the past 17 years, but only when they were supported by sound and sensible evidence that such changes would improve the program—not wreck it.

I want to remind the Senate that our housing program came near to going on the rocks through the FHA scandals which were uncovered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee when I was its chairman.

There was a Democratic executive administration at that time, but I applauded then and I applaud now the help I received from the Democratic members of my committee in ferreting out the cause of the trouble.

And we unanimously enacted legislation to correct the situation and thereby saved the housing program for those who needed and deserved it.

It is a great disappointment to me that today I cannot find in this housing bill enough of the good to outweigh the bad.

The bill the Senate moved to third reading on last Friday morning contains a new and dangerous concept of Federal housing assistance which I consider unconscionable and unnecessary.

The feature I refer to is the new policy of 40-year Government-insured mortgages to cover housing purchases for anybody who wants to buy a house that costs no more than $15,000.

I recognize that we have had 40-year mortgage programs for a number of years and I have supported them. But they were designed to meet unusual circumstances.

We first approved 40-year mortgages for section 213, or cooperative housing, which we heard so much about in the discussion of this bill. In this instance, we find a situation far different from the program of individual ownership contained in this bill. In this program there is multiple liability and, in most cases, larger and more substantial types of structures.

We also approved terms up to 50 years for the elderly housing direct loan program, but here again the necessity for low payments was an obvious need for a class of people who needed help in this manner.

Then we come to another category of 40-year mortgages, the section 221 housing. This was a program designed and approved for the assistance of families forced out of their homes by Government action.

These families, I want to repeat, are families who have been, or will be, forced from their homes by urban renewal programs, highway construction, or any other type of Government action over which they had no control. It was recognized that many of these families, not anticipating the need for home purchasing on a comparatively short notice, would not be in a financial position to meet heavy mortgage payments.

These programs were approved to meet unusual conditions. Yet these 40-year programs carried mortgage interest at the going market rate.

Let me stress that point. Despite the consideration of the Congress for the special needs of these families, a market interest rate was applied in each 40-year program.

In this bill we combine the 40-year mortgage with a subsidized interest rate; not to meet circumstances such as those which existed in previous 40-year programs, but apparently to create a springboard from which other nationalized housing schemes might be launched in the future.

From where did all the clamor come for such a precedent-shattering use of Federal assistance in housing?

It came from those who used statistics which, when so interpreted, gave hint to possible political expediency by attempting to meet those statistics with a windfall from the Federal Government whether or not it was wanted or expected.

True, the Senate did wisely require an important change in the 40-year program by requiring a small down payment, but we cannot escape the fact that we are being asked to establish a whole new principle in mortgaging and an unreasonable principle of subsidizing the financing of those mortgages.

It is my humble prediction that if these new approaches are politically motivated that our housing program will go down the drain through public objection.

I feel only slightly appeased because the Senate accepted my amendment to prevent a new public housing program for "moderate income" families under the rental section of the 40-year program.

I certainly cannot be jubilant, although a bit thankful, that also accepted was my amendment which would prevent the discriminatory use by the Housing Commissioner of interest rates to the borrowers in the same rental section.

We have identified the groups for whom the 40-year mortgage programs were established prior to this bill and the need for the longer maturity period was obvious in each case.

But, we cannot identify the group of families which will qualify for this special treatment under this bill because there is no means in the proposed legislation by which they can be identified.

Anybody who wishes to purchase a house costing no more than $15,000 will qualify. Anybody. The amount of income is not restricted; unusual hardship is not required. Nothing is required by an application to purchase at low downpayment, 40 years to pay at an interest rate the Federal Government admittedly will subsidize.

There are a great many items throughout the bill which represent serious departures from what have been successful operations of our housing program.

In the 40-year phase of the bill we find, in addition to the maturity and interest conditions, the right of an option for cash or debentures on defaulted mortgages, the payment of accrued interest on defaulted mortgages and the right of the Commissioner to reduce the insurance premium rate to one-fourth of 1 percent.

In the committee report on this bill its sponsors made a point that the 40-year mortgage phase of the bill would do a great deal for the economy of this country. I would change one word of that comment by saying the 40-year mortgage program will "do a great deal to the economy of this country."

Let me remind the Members of this Senate that there are 60 million homes in this country of ours which are owned by the families who live in them. We might be taking millions of those homes off the market if we enact this program into law.

Millions of these homeowners who will be helping to pay the subsidy for this program will be helping to destroy the chance of disposing of their present homes. Why? Because who will want to buy an existing house when he can buy a new house on low downpayments and at subsidized interest rates?

I want now to mention the home improvement section of the bill both as it reached the Senate and as it is now. I really don't feel boastful about the change I managed to have made in this section although the change will channel the assistance where it is needed most.

Originally, the bill would have provided 100-percent insured home improvement loans up to $10,000 for 25 years for anybody—again, I say, anybody. No security required, if the Commissioner didn't want any.

How ridiculous. A person could buy a new home for $9,000 on a 40-year mortgage with subsidized interest and immediately borrow $10,000 for 25 years with no security in order to build three more rooms on the house, or put in a swimming pool if he wished.

My effort to reduce the amount to $7,000 and the maturity to 15 years would have been somewhat more sensible but my real feeling is that, for most purposes, the existing home improvement program is sufficient because it permits loans to $3,500 for up to 5 years.

The exceptional cases of higher loan need would be to rehabilitate older homes, but the bill sponsors failed to limit the bill to that until my amendment was accepted providing for loans to $10,000 for 20 years but applicable only to dwellings at least 10 years old.

This section needs further correcting before it gets us into a peck of trouble.

A trend toward more and more public housing made its appearance in this bill, although the Senate did succeed in removing one instance from the bill. This trend appeared in three places in the bill as it was brought to the Senate.

First, of course, was in the request for 100,000 additional public housing units. My attempt to reduce the figure to 37,000 units failed, but the fact still remains that the Housing Commissioner's own testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was to the effect that applications for units were coming in at a fraction of the 37,000 units the Senate had previously approved.

The second instance of the public housing trend appeared in the new 40-year rental housing mortgaging section where public agencies and bodies would be permitted to borrow Federal funds at subsidized interest rates and build rental housing for moderate-income families. The Senate accepted my amendment removing the public agencies and bodies from the eligible list of borrowers.

The third instance of public housing remains in the bill. It is in the section providing for direct loans by the Federal Government for housing for the elderly. Here we find again as eligible borrowers public agencies and bodies.

Throughout the bill we find increased costs to the Federal Government to the point where authorized expenditures in the bill nearly equal all of the authorizations made by Congress for the housing program since its inception.

An example occurs in the capital grant authorization for urban renewal. Despite the fact the record proves no necessity for a $2.5 billion additional authorization at this time, the Senate rejected my amendment to reduce the figure by $750 million.

Coupled with the tremendous cost of this bill, which amounts to about $6 billion, the Housing Commissioner is given far more discretionary power in the use of the funds than Congress has ever seen fit to give the Commissioner in previous years.

In summation, we might well look upon this housing bill as the ruination of a time-tested Federal housing program; the breaking of the high cost barrier of housing; creation of a Federal catch-all basin for unsound schemes and political hokey-pokey, and the beginning of the end of that one-time feeling of security that "a man's home is his castle."

After all, even if we should defeat these amendments, we still would have the Federal housing program that is serving us so well and will continue to do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is ready to speak to the Senate, and he will be here momentarily. In the meantime, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I wish to make only a general statement in regard to the bill; and in the course of my remarks I wish to submit, for printing in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, the two tables to which I previously referred in the course of my colloquy with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. One of the tables shows what the proposed housing legislation amounts to, in authorizations, and also shows its impact on the budget for the fiscal year 1962.

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

Proposed housing legislation, Senate bill, S. 1922—Program authorizations and estimated fiscal year 1962 net budget expenditures

[In millions]

	Program authorization	Estimated budget expenditures, fiscal year 1962
Loans and investments:		
FNMA investments (special assistance), Presidential authorization [1]	$750	$65
College housing [1]	1,350	10
Public facilities [1]	50	15
Housing for the elderly [2]	50	10
Mass transportation [1]	100	10
VA direct housing loans [1]	1,200	300
SBA loans for displaced businesses [2]	50	25
Farm housing [1]	(3)	40
Subtotal	3,550	475
Grants:		
Urban renewal [4]	2,500	3
Urban planning assistance [2]	80	3
Public housing:		
Annual contributions [5]	(79)	----------
Demonstration grants [2]	10	2
Mass transportation demonstration grants [6]	(50)	2
Subtotal	2,590	10
Total, housing bill	6,140	575

[1] Treasury borrowing authorization.
[2] Authorization for appropriations; new obligational authority when actually appropriated.
[3] Assumes use of Treasury borrowing authority which would otherwise have expired for commitment purposes.
[4] Contract authority.
[5] Assumes use of $79,000,000 balance of contract authority from the $336,000,000 authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, which otherwise would be unavailable, to place under contract approximately 100,000 units of low-rent housing. Effects of additional subsidy for units occupied by elderly persons cannot be estimated with available information.
[6] The bill authorizes the Administrator to contract to make up to ⅔ grants for mass transportation demonstration projects. The $50,000,000 authorization for this purpose would be part of the total urban renewal contract authorization.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The second table——

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does either of the tables show any statement of the cost of the public-housing program?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, one of them shows the annual contribution of $79 million a year, maximum, for public housing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does it show the maximum cost of the program as being more than $3 billion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it simply shows the annual contribution as being a maximum of $79 million.

I stated awhile ago, in explaining the table, that, assuming it was going to cost the maximum, and extending it over a period of 40 years, the cost would be in the neighborhood of $3 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. On making inquiry of the staff of the Senator's committee the other day, I was told it was hoped that payments could be reduced to about 85 percent of the total.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. As a matter of fact, in years past, it has run as low as 66⅔ percent. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But it is the hope now to reduce the payment to about 85 percent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the current experience is about 85 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The other table to which I referred was one which showed the cost of the housing program under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, showing the net budget expenditure over the years, cumulative to June 30, 1960, and the total Government equity as of June 30, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

COST OF HOUSING PROGRAMS UNDER THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Housing programs have generally been profitable enterprises. Exclusive of the cost of war and defense emergency housing programs, and AEC towns, the Federal Government's housing programs under the HHFA have operated at a net surplus of $496.4 million if credit is taken for the Government's equity as of June 30, 1960:

Total budget expenditures or receipts and Government equity on housing programs as of June 30, 1960

[In millions]

	Net budget expenditures cumulative to June 30, 1960	Government equity as of June 30, 1960
Salaries and expenses	$47.8	$1.0
College housing	754.7	761.8
Public facilities	46.5	45.3
Public works planning	14.1	14.4
Urban renewal	413.8	75.6
Urban planning grants	7.3	----------
Federal National Mortgage Association	3,034.8	3,483.2
Federal Housing Administration	−20.4	866.7
Public Housing Administration	984.5	94.7
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	−83.2	353.6
Total	5,199.9	5,696.3
Net position (surplus) as of June 30, 1960	496.4	

NOTE.—The full explanation of the source of these figures may be found on pp. 25 to 28 of the committee's review of federal housing programs published as an appendix to 1961 housing hearings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted may be extended by a total of 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished minority leader, is going to speak. I understand he wants about 20 minutes. Under the agreement, he has 15 minutes out of the half hour, and I yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How does the time stand? Has the opposition time been exhausted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition time has been exhausted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, is it understood that I have yielded the Senator 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is understood.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, we are now approaching the voting period on the housing bill. I had intended in the first instance, when I prepared some remarks on this subject, to deal with a matter which was ultimately taken care of by an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It related to striking out all of title 6 of the bill. That was a provision to authorize the Administrator to make loans up to $100 million to States and local public bodies to acquire land for permanent open spaces.

That amendment was offered. The Senate has voted upon that amendment, and has seen fit, in its wisdom, to delete it. So the bill, at least in my judgment, has been improved to the extent that $100 million provided by it will not be grants, on the basis of 25 percent or 35 percent, depending on the circumstances, which would be within the control of the Administrator to make to States and local public bodies. But, notwithstanding that fact, I find myself still in opposition to the bill, and there are some reasons for it.

At the appropriate time, I intend to insert in the RECORD what the budget experience will be in fiscal 1962. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the program authorization and 1962 budget expenditures which are listed on page 64 of the hearings. That table indicates that in the fiscal year 1962 the net budget expenditures, not only of the program that is before us, but of the program that has been authorized by previous Congresses, will have a budget impact of $1,411 million plus.

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

PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION AND 1962 BUDGET EXPENDITURES

The following table was prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and is included in this report for the information of the Senate. The estimates of budget expenditures have not been analyzed by the committee, and do not necessarily represent its views.

PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION—SENATE COMMITTEE BILL, S. 1922

Program authorizations and estimated fiscal year 1962 net budget expenditures

[Millions of dollars]

	Type of authority [1]	Program authorizations			Fiscal year 1962 net budget expenditures		
		Previously enacted	Committee bill	Total	Enacted authorizations	New authorizations	Total
FNMA investment in mortgages and improvement loans (special assistance), Presidential authorization	BA	950	750	1,700	225.0	65.0	290.0
Loan programs:							
College housing loans	BA	1,675	1,350	3,025	234.6	10.0	244.6
Public facility loans	BA	150	50	200	39.9	15.0	54.9
Housing for the elderly	AA	50	50	100	13.5	10.0	23.5
Mass transportation loans	BA		100	100		10.0	10.0
Subtotal		1,875	1,550	3,425	288.0	45.0	333.0
Grant programs:							
Urban renewal grants	CA	2,000	2,500	4,500	252.9	3.0	255.9
Urban planning assistance	AA	20	80	100	6.0	3.0	9.0
Public housing: [1]							
Annual contributions [2]	CA	(336)		(336)	172.8		172.8
Demonstration grants	AA		10	10		2.0	2.0
Open space grants	CA		100	100		2.5	2.5
Mass transportation demonstration grants [3]	CA		(50)	(50)		2.0	2.0
Subtotal		2,020	2,690	4,710	431.7	12.5	444.2
All other HHFA programs and activities		(4)	(4)	(4)	−115.7		−115.7
Total, HHFA		4,845	4,990	9,835	829.0	122.5	951.5
Programs of other agencies:							
VA direct housing loans	BA	1,575	1,200	2,775	115.0	300.0	415.0
Farm housing programs	BA	(5)	(5)	(5)	5.0	40.0	45.0
Subtotal		1,575	1,200	2,775	120.0	340.0	460.0
Total, housing bill		6,420	6,190	12,610	949.0	462.5	1,411.5

[1] Key: BA—Treasury borrowing authorization.
CA—Contract authority.
AA—Authorization for appropriations; new obligational authority when actually appropriated.

[2] Assumes use of $79,000,000 balance of contract authority, which otherwise would be unavailable, to place under contract approximately 100,000 units of low-rent housing. Effects of additional subsidy for units occupied by elderly persons and families cannot be estimated with available information.

[3] Senate committee bill authorizes the Administrator to contract to make up to ⅔ grants for mass transportation demonstration projects. The $50,000,000 authorization for this purpose would be part of the total urban renewal contract authorization.

[4] Not applicable.

[5] Assumes use of Treasury borrowing authority which would otherwise have expired for commitment purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The budget consideration here is, in my judgment, certainly not the least of the considerations that should guide us in approaching our responsibilities on the housing bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just before the Senator from Illinois started to speak, I put in the RECORD a table which is up to date, since amendment of the bill by the Senate. There is not a great deal of difference between the new table and the one the Senator from Illinois has placed in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Except that the table the Senator put in the RECORD shows a budget impact of $575 million, but the table I put in the RECORD shows a budget impact in fiscal year 1962 of $1,411 million. That information was submitted by the Housing Administration. It is a part of the literature which accompanies this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call attention to the fact that that is a combination of the existing program and the new program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned that fact. That is correct. I made it clear.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the Senator was talking about the impact of the present bill on the budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am willing to stand on the RECORD of what I said.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a combination of what has been authorized before plus what is authorized in this bill. It will have a budget impact of $1,411 million on the budget in fiscal year 1962.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Subject to the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. The amount might be raised or lowered a little. It is possible the amount might be lowered by $100 million. But the figure is substantially correct, I think.

In some earlier observations on this matter, I pointed out to the Senate that the January budget which was sent to the Congress by the prior administration indicated a surplus of $1,500 million, in rounded figures. There have been two revisions of the Eisenhower budget since that time. The first one came on the 28th of March. That has to be set down as a Kennedy revision, because obviously that revision was made by the incumbent administration, and it indicated a budget deficit, instead of a surplus, of $2,800 million.

Another revision came from the Kennedy administration on the 25th of May. That shows a deficit of $3,550 million.

I fancy that we shall be here for quite some time, and I apprehend also that we shall be adding to this amount in the form of new functions to be authorized, as, for instance, an increase in the stream pollution bill, and the supplemental and the deficiency appropriation bills, when the departments have had an opportunity to estimate and indicate

to the Congress, through the Budget Bureau, what they may need to carry out their functions for fiscal year 1962.

What I say at this point is a guess, and it has to be a guess, because I do not know what the "moon" is going to take.

We are talking now about moon shots. It has been indicated that perhaps we ought to spend $8 billion, $9 billion, or some such amount, over a period of 5 years, in order to get to Luna. It is a great thing in the field of lunar dynamics, I suppose, and there must be people who think this is one of the urgent matters before the country today. I can only say that I hope lunar dynamics will not become dynamic lunacy before we finish, and will not continue to push the budget ceilingward until we reach the moon. We are almost in orbit with the budget now. We have finally crashed the $100 billion barrier.

For fiscal year 1962—and certainly these figures are not quite complete—the output, including trust funds and the regular expenditure budget, will be $106 billion plus. The income from all sources, including railroad retirement to go into a trust account and social security to go into a trust account and all others, will be $102 billion, to compare with the outgo of $106 billion. So on a cash expenditure versus outgo basis, for the fiscal year 1962 the budget deficit will be in excess of $4 billion.

I risk my reputation as a prophet, even though my distinguished friend from Alabama knows that "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country," that the probabilities are the deficit will be infinitely higher and that the budget deficit will be in excess of $5 billion before we conclude fiscal year 1962, which will be 1 year from the end of this month. That is a matter which disturbs me some.

Yes, as my distinguished and scholarly Biblical friend has said to me:

> A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house—

As stated in the Ancient Book.

If the Senate is my country or my house, I am not sure that the gift of prophecy or the words of prophecy will fall upon fertile ears. They may be entirely ignored before we finish.

But I do know what a figure means, Madam President, and there is something irretrievable and irresistible about a figure. I believe it was Charles Dickens who said that there is nothing so irresistible as a fact, and I say, "That's for sure."

This is a fact, since it comes from the Bureau of the Budget, and I expect the Bureau of the Budget to be very careful with its figures.

In consequence, we are spending ourselves into a deficit position which can only be measured in terms of inflationary impact in the grocery stores and in the market places of the country. There is no other way to estimate it.

When, for instance, we spend for public works and we spend for housing, we are not making expenditures in the field of consumables but in the field of durables, as we sometimes put it. As time goes on, a growing amount of purchasing power will be lodged in the hands of the people. Obviously it cannot be offset, when we engage a dipper dredge with an 11-yard dipper to throw earth upon a levee. We cannot say that the people whose incomes are being enhanced can buy any section of that in a consumer form, to dampen down the fevers of inflation.

That situation is taking on new form. It is taking on new substance. It is taking on new urgency constantly. It is no wonder that the students of our fiscal and economic situation and policies are becoming increasingly concerned about the dangers of inflationary fever and the inflationary contagion which only brings the prices up in the markets of the country, and which will be succeeded, finally, by pressure for increased wages. When we do this, there will be requests for more money than is authorized in the bill before us, and once more our country will be caught in the inflationary pincers.

I trust that will not obtain, but how can one come to any other conclusion, in view of the $9 billion authorization presently before us?

This is a bewildering bill. Frankly, I have found this to be the most bewildering piece of proposed legislation with which I have had an opportunity to deal in a good many years. Title I deals with new housing programs—housing for moderate-income families, the market rate rental housing, the below-market rate housing, loans for improvements of existing structures, and also experimental housing. Of course, experimental housing is demonstration housing. When imaginative people come up with fanciful ideas about houses a few years from now, and other people who occupy the no-downpayment with 40-years-to-pay houses become entranced—and they will become quickly entranced and intrigued by new designs and new arrangements in housing—the distinguished head of the family, who will be sitting across the table from his wife at dinner some night, will hear his wife say, "Joe, I just saw the Jones' house at the end of town. Let us go out this afternoon and take a look at it." They will take a look at it, and they will both agree it would be desirable to have a house like that. Their house will be not quite so futuristic and not quite so modern.

Then this couple will look at the table, to see the point they have reached so far as payments are concerned. They will discover in a little while, from the table I have presented heretofore, that after they have paid for 20 years for a $10,000 house they will have a $311 equity. That will be the case after 20 years, Madam President.

Models will change. Styles will change. I am not sure, if I were in that position, that I would not say to the lady across the dinner table, "Oh, let's move out tonight and go down the road about 20 miles, because there we can put our furniture in one of those futuristic, impressionistic new designs so appealing to the heart."

So we have before us the provision, modified by the Senator to require a 3-percent downpayment, but what will that be against a 40-year amortization period? It will be an open invitation to abandon. That is what it will be.

Who can say what kind of a load the Federal Government will have to bear by way of foreclosed property?

Madam President, I remember the fight I had on the Home Owners Loan Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I have more time, Madam President? I yield myself more time if I do. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only 5 minutes? Will the Senator from Alabama yield me 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I understood that I had yielded the Senator from Illinois 5 minutes. Has the Senator already spoken 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has used 15 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was so spellbound by the Senator's eloquence I did not recognize the passage of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know he was, Madam President.

We will have to get more time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 20 minutes, 10 minutes to each side.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Altogether?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Altogether.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Including the new time allocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Including the new time allocation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, we may have to have more time. [Laughter.]

Madam President, I must speak until the clock shows 4 o'clock. I must build this house one room at a time until some of our absent Members arrive. With the cooperation of my friend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] we will keep the debate going until 4 o'clock, if the Lord is willing. I am sure He will be, because I believe He is on my side in this debate.

I shall describe the problem of long-range financing with only a 3-percent downpayment. That kind of downpayment is not much of a hedge.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table at this point in the RECORD.

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

Depreciated value of $10,000 home and comparison of upaid balance of $10,000 mortgage, 40-year term at 5½ percent interest

End of year	Depreciated value of property [1]	Outstanding balance of debt	Equity	End of year	Depreciated value of property [1]	Outstanding balance of debt	Equity
0	$10,000	$10,000	0	21	7,600	7,275	325
1	9,950	9,929	21	22	7,400	7,051	349
2	9,900	9,854	46	23	7,200	6,813	387
3	9,850	9,775	75	24	7,000	6,563	437
4	9,800	9,691	109	25	6,800	6,298	502
5	9,750	9,603	147	26	6,600	6,018	582
6	9,700	9,509	191	27	6,400	5,722	678
7	9,650	9,411	239	28	6,200	5,410	790
8	9,600	9,307	293	29	6,000	5,080	920
9	9,550	9,196	354	30	5,800	4,732	1,068
10	9,500	9,080	420	31	5,600	4,363	1,237
11	9,450	8,957	493	32	5,400	3,974	1,426
12	9,400	8,828	572	33	5,200	3,564	1,636
13	9,200	8,690	510	34	5,000	3,130	1,870
14	9,000	8,546	454	35	4,800	2,671	2,129
15	8,800	8,393	407	36	4,600	2,187	2,413
16	8,600	8,231	369	37	4,400	1,675	2,725
17	8,400	8,060	340	38	4,300	1,134	3,166
18	8,200	7,880	320	39	4,200	563	3,637
19	8,000	7,689	311	40	4,100	0	4,100
20	7,800	7,488	312				

[1] See accompanying text for assumptions and qualifications.
Source: Federal Housing Administration, Division of Research and Statistics.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This will indicate pretty well that after 20 years of payment there would be an equity of only $311. That feature is one thing that is wrong with the bill, particularly in an accelerated age when conditions change so fantastically fast, and is one reason why I oppose the bill.

The bill contains title II, housing for the elderly, and would lift the age limit with respect to those who are disabled.

Title III, urban renewal and planning, would grant spending authority, increased by $2½ billion, which would be given free. Those are not loans from the Federal Treasury. Gift money is provided. We are becoming pretty prodigal so far as the Federal Treasury is concerned. The amount authorized would be for urban planning grants. The Federal share would be increased from one-half to two-thirds.

Then there is title IV, loans for college housing, community facilities, mass transportation and planning. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that I do not know how the railroads got in the bill, but they did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can tell the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They were included by the unanimous vote of the Republican members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That group would not include me, because, notwithstanding the fact that 12 railroad presidents were in my office last year concerning this subject, I did not say "Yes."

I did not say "yes" to the request, because I believe it is a subject that ought not to be handled in a housing bill. The problem of the railroads has no business in the present bill. Transportation comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, and that item should have been more substantially justified before the committee that has jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 5 minutes which the Senator requested has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, Have I 10 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

There are increases in respect to the Federal National Mortgage Association and provision is made for the expansion of the FHA insurance program.

Title VI, refers to open space for urban development. Thank goodness, we succeeded in having that provision eliminated. Thank goodness, we have had the third reading of the bill, so that that provision cannot be put back into the bill. The House may put it back. I do not know. But if the conference report returns to the Senate and contains that item, I now serve notice on the Senate conferees that the provision will be subject to a fight, and it will be a good one. I believe my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota, will join me in that effort.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there is any doubt, I assure the Senator from Illinois I will do what I can. The Senate has gone on record on that point by a 46 to 42 vote, and I hope the Senate will stand by its position. The amendment to strike out title VI of the bill, as reported by the committee, had bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle. If I remember correctly, 24 Republicans and 22 Democrats voted for my amendment last Thursday. The fight was not partisan in any sense. It was bipartisan and showed that the Senate thought we should not start on that kind of a program at this time, attractive as it might be under other conditions. The proposal that the administrator should be authorized to make grants up to $100 million, without any prior action by the Appropriations Committee, was not unusual. The faith of the United States was to have been solemnly pledged to provide the money, regardless of anything else, once the Administrator had spoken. We ought not to tie the hands of the Treasury that way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, that subject was included in the bill until the Senate, in its wisdom, eliminated it. But if it comes back, the fight must be resumed.

Title VII relates to farm housing and an extension of the direct loan program to veterans. We authorized $1 million for direct loans to veterans on the ground that they were located in sparsely settled and rural areas where service could not be obtained, I sat across the table from President Eisenhower at the usual Tuesday morning conference, and when that item arose, I said, "Mr. President, if you go down the road of direct loans from the Treasury, you will never come back." Thank God, he would not sign the bill.

Again we are confronted with the provision, elaborated upon and increased in amount by direct loans from the Treasury.

I was deeply entranced the other day by a statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. The inspiration came from a banker in a small town in Alabama where loans could not be serviced. But since that time the Housing Administration has carried on a program, which has been almost nationwide in scope, to orient country banks so that loans could be made without direct loans from the Treasury. I believe such action can still be taken. But we will live to see the day when the amount will snowball. Then what shall we say to the other components of the population in our country? People who live in cities, on farms, and everyone else will say, "You have given the veterans direct loans from the Treasury"—not merely a guarantee, not merely insurance, but money out of the public Treasury. How would we respond to other groups in the United States that would come, hat in hand, first with their entreaties, then with their supplications, and finally with their demands?

I wish my friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would bend his ear. I hope my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will let him listen to me for a moment. I wish to talk about the Senator's distinguished predecessor, Cordell Hull. He was a distinguished statesman.

Mr. GORE. He was indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Believe me, he was a distinguished Senator. I remember one night at a little social function at one of the downtown hotels we had a little visit from him. We talked about the

farm program, and that great statesman said to me, with respect to handouts, "Congressman, I suppose at first the farmers will resist gratuities from the Treasury. A little later they will demur. But finally they will demand."

Cordell Hull was so eminently right, because that is exactly the state in which we find ourselves today. We talk about direct loans from the Treasury to veterans. How long would it be before other components in our population would say, "We, too, are entitled to the largess of this Government, and we want to be included in any proposed legislation that comes along."

That ought to frighten anyone who has some regard for the solidarity and the fiscal integrity of this country. However, it is in the bill. I cannot accept that kind of provision. We have modified the provision with respect to the 40-year loans. I salute the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Even though once in a while we have a little semantic discussion, I salute him for the effort he made the other day. I regret extremely that that action was not sustained finally, and that it was modified even to the extent of 3 percent. I do not believe it is enough. I do not believe we can do business on that basis without finally finding this country confronted with a great many shoestring homeowners who one day will find it to their advantage to abandon their homes. Then the House and the Senate will be confronted with the problem of what to do with the properties, because we have guaranteed and insured the loans.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generous remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois. Although my amendment was not carried in full, we did succeed in requiring some downpayment. It is $300 on a $10,000 house. I submit to my distinguished colleague and friend that even a small $300 downpayment is better than no downpayment at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, indeed it is. However, the ghost of another challenge rises up. I fought the Home Owners Loan Corporation to a standstill on their policies, and there was a reason for it. We finally wound up with 250,000 dwellings that the Federal Government had to foreclose on, notwithstanding all the nonsense and the persiflage and the airy discussion. I followed it year after year. Uncle Sam had the houses. Who shall say we will not have them again.

I have here an article published in the Washington Star of May 17. It is entitled "48,000 Lose Homes From Foreclosures." Insofar as I can tell, the point made in the article is that that is the largest number of foreclosures since 1941. In addition, the article examines into the reasons for it. The reasons are two; first, that families have been purchasing more expensive homes; second, and more important, that the terms were so much easier that they were buying homes on a shoestring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have not quite finished the story, I am distressed to say. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What shall we do about 3 percent, with 40 years to pay? What will the foreclosure record be like?

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

FORTY-EIGHT THOUSAND LOSE HOMES FROM FORECLOSURES

NEW YORK, May 17.—Forty-eight thousand American families lost their homes through foreclosure in 1960, the largest number since 1941, the American Home Magazine said yesterday.

In its current issue, the publication said the rising foreclosure rate is attributed by the Federal Home Loan Bank board to two factors:

1. Families are purchasing more expensive homes than they used to. Inevitably, some are bound to overreach themselves and get hurt.

2. Mortgage terms are easier than they used to be and a lot of houses are bought on a shoestring.

"Such unforeseen catastrophes as long layoffs, unemployment, illness or death can completely wreck financial planning," American Home said. "They rank high on the list of causes of foreclosure.

"The family that is on thin ice is the one that made a very small downpayment and has a 25- to 30-year loan."

American Home cited Wichita, Kans., as a city hard hit by foreclosures after Boeing Airplane Co. cut back on aircraft production. Foreclosures there totaled 1,471 last year, it said.

Of 1960's 48,000 foreclosures, more than 11,000 were on Veterans' Administration loans and more than 7,500 on loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration, the publication stated.

This, said the magazine, is because FHA and VA borrowers have less of their own money invested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, of course, there is the question as to whether this is a forcing operation. I must ask my distinguished friend from Alabama whether he has had verification of these figures. My information is that the FHA applications, at an adjusted rate for April 1961, numbered 217,000. The Federal Housing and Home Finance Administration estimated that that was a drop of 3 percent from March, and that it is the first time in 4 months that it has declined; also, that it is the lowest April rate since 1957. I ask my distinguished friend whether that is substantially correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator is correct. Those are the figures that were reported. It shows that the annual rate was reduced, I believe, to 1,200,000. That is the reduction. That is on the new basis, which would be about $1 million under the old figure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only interpret the figure in my own way, that these housing starts are dropping. It looks to me like a forcing operation. It is a forcing operation at this period in the American economy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I believe that the fair interpretation is that this is a reaction to the recession we have been in. There is always a drag, and as we pull out of the recession—I believe we are pulling out, and that we are pretty well on our way—we can reasonably expect that the figure will come up. This is not forced draft legislation. This is, as I said many times, a replacement for our old public housing program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I devoutly hope that my distinguished friend from Alabama is correct. I have to interpret the information in my own way, and I see no such interpretation in these figures. I make them a part of my remarks, so that they may be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and can be referred to at some future day, to determine whether I was right or wrong.

I make only one other point, and that is with respect to community facility loans. There is an increase in the authorization from $150 to $300 million, $100 million of which is earmarked for mass transportation loans. I do not believe it is needed. I do not believe that the transport item has a proper place in the bill. I believe that item should have gone to the Committee on Commerce. At least a pilot amount would have been enough, instead of reaching up into the very stars for vast sums to do the job, when the whole matter has not yet been thoroughly explored.

Community financing has been at a high level and is at a high level. I understand that there have been some $22 billion in community facility loans in the last 3 years. In the first months of 1961—and I believe this figure comes from the investment bankers of America, who keep close touch with this matter—the community facility loans granted and approved by the voters amounted to $2,800 million. That is a 7-point increase in the first quarter of 1961 over 1960.

Those are some of the items, Madam President, that I find objectionable in the bill and serve as the predicate for my determination that I shall vote against it.

I have only one other thing to say, and then I shall be through. I recommend to Members of the Senate a very interesting report which was made a few years ago by the U.S. Savings & Loan League. The title of the report is "Who Buys the Houses?" As a great organization, it has made use of literally thousands of savings and loan and building and loan associations scattered all over the countryside. Actually, one of the biggest component members of the league is the First Federal Savings & Loan Association in Chicago. I am a member of the board of directors of that association. Once I resigned, because when the question of fiddling with the 12-percent reserve for mutual sav-

ings banks and savings and loan associations came to the Senate floor, and the bankers of my State got in my hair, I sent a telegram resigning from the board. Then I asked the Senate for a special dispensation under the rule not to have to vote on the issue, so that it could not be said that any action I took represented a conflict of interest. The Senate granted that dispensation.

I say that because I do not want anybody to rise up on my oblique side, trying to discredit all this by saying that I have a peculiar interest in it. I have been a building-and-loaner since I was old enough to warble the English language. I expect to remain one to the very end of my days, because building and loans are a great activating force in the country and are predicated upon the gospel of thrift.

Here is the report. It has never been gainsaid. Here will be found the statement that two out of every three houses, two out of every three buildings, which are constructed in the United States, are not built with FHA insurance, not with VA insurance. They are built on the conventional loan basis and are financed by the thrift of the American people, as it finds its way into the coffers of those thrift agencies.

Madam President, I shall not place the whole report in the RECORD; I simply ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the two pages the title of which is "Summary and Conclusions."

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

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The world of home mortgages is like a family of three children where one does the bulk of the work and the other two get the bulk of the attention. Because of the perennial involvement in politics and their unpredictable and disturbing fluctuations, the insured and guaranteed mortgage operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration tend in some quarters to be considered the dominant influences in the housing market. Yet of the outstanding mortgage debt on 1- to 4-family structures, the insured-guaranteed areas can claim only 44 percent, the remainder being in conventional loans.

Another reason for greater acquaintance of the public with insured and guaranteed mortgage operations than with conventional mortgage operations is the copious flow of information that comes from the Government agencies, especially the FHA, the statistical services of which have always been of a high order. Conventional lending, conducted independently as it is by thousands of institutions, is not susceptible to such continuous and detailed reporting. In producing this, the first of a series of similar surveys, the U.S. Savings & Loan League is endeavoring to provide the public with much needed information in a vital sector of home mortgage finance.

The U.S. League study, supported by information recently released by the Bureau of the Census, reveals the breadth of the availability of conventional financing to families throughout the range of income. Since we are overwhelmingly a middle-class Nation, it is to be expected that the greatest volume of conventional financing would be for families in the middle-income range. Such is the case. The concentration, however, is distinctly less than in the case with either the FHA or VA types of financing, even in the type of metropolitan area represented in the survey.

Conventional financing, while broadly serving the middle-income group, does not do so to the neglect of other important sectors of demand. As the U.S. League's findings show, and as the census data more strongly confirms, conventional financing is more extensively available to lower income borrowers and to lower priced houses than is the financing sponsored by the Government agencies. Had the league's survey included smaller communities than the metropolitan areas covered, this circumstance undoubtedly would have been even more strikingly disclosed.

The breadth of the coverage of conventional financing is especially significant in view of the steady upward creep, over the postwar period, of the median income of FHA borrowers and the median initial amount of the insured loan, both of which appear to have risen further than can be accounted for by increases in incomes or construction costs during the period.

Another important characteristic of conventional lending is the service it renders to the financing of used-house purchases. Its greater availability than insured or guaranteed lending for this purpose is attested by the census inventory; and the broad range of coverage is shown in both the census and the league studies. Since most of our families must be accommodated in other than newly built houses, and since purchases of previously occupied houses exceeded those of new ones, the advantage of having a supply of funds always at hand to facilitate these transactions, and thus to aid in the general upgrading of housing standards, cannot be overestimated. This need conventional financing meets in large degree.

The importance of this contribution goes beyond that of aiding the initial transaction. Availability of credit for the used-house market is today almost as important a factor in the stimulation of new construction as financing of used cars is for the stimulation of the market for new automobiles, and for the same reason. Today, more and more buyers of new houses are second-time or even third-time buyers and their ability to fulfill their objective depends upon their ability to sell the house already owned. Conventional financing has plainly been a vital force in this linked reaction.

The whole area of conventional financing needs broader study and understanding. As each year the original purposes of the Government-sponsored programs become blurred and their operations more disrupted by political action, dependence upon conventional lending is certain to grow. To make this increasing dependence attain its maximum fruitfulness in terms of expanded service, it is essential that the strengths and shortcomings of conventional lending be clearly revealed and that, through this knowledge, the strengths be preserved and the shortcomings corrected. It is hoped that the present study will prove to be at least a modest step in this direction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, if anyone wishes to get a copy of this report, he can do so. All he has to do is to write to the U.S. Savings & Loans League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. They will send him as many copies as he wishes to have.

The summary and conclusions support all the figures which have been reported. So when we are dealing with a housing bill, we think it encompasses all the housing in the country. Why, it touches less than one-third of the housing activities. In proportion as we diminish the deeper intrusion of the Federal Government into this field, I think the housing industry will be infinitely better off.

Madam President, I could assign other reasons. There would be no point in doing so. I do this only by way of fortification of the conclusions I have reached after thoroughly studying the bill and its policies and considering what it projects for the future of our country.

I fully intend to vote against its approval.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] desires to submit a conference report. I yield 5 minutes to him for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 12, 1961, pp. 10059–10060, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, the principal point at issue between the two bodies was as to the amount to be authorized for the procurement of aircraft for the Strategic Air Command. In that respect, the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate.

There was three other differences between the two bodies.

One was for an item of $21,200,000 in the House bill to authorize the installing of turbo-fan engines on 15 of the C–135 aircraft that are being procured for the Military Air Transport Service. These engines provide increased thrust and thereby reduce the take-off distance required for the aircraft. They also have a lower fuel consumption, which permits greater payloads of longer distances. The Senate agreed to that amendment.

The House authorized three new additional jet aircraft for the Special Air Mission Squadron of the Military Air Transport Service. Three aircraft of this type are now in inventory. The House had provided authorization for three additional aircraft of this type, but the conference agreement provides for one. These new modern planes are special aircraft to transport high officials of the Government.

The other difference had to do with the frigates for the Navy. The Senate version of the bill had provided authorization for the construction of seven conventionally powered, guided-missile frigates. The House version contemplated a total of six such frigates, two of which could have been nuclear powered. The conference agreement restores the number of guided-missile frigates to be authorized to seven, but would permit one of these to be nuclear powered.

The conference report as a whole authorizes appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in a total of $12,571 million. This figure is $71.2 million more than the Senate version of the bill.

Madam President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a conferee on this side of the aisle, I believe this is a very satisfactory settlement of the differences between the two branches of Congress. The principal difference was in the continuation of the long-range bomber production.

As the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, has stated, the House yielded on that item to the Senate version.

The other items were of a lesser nature but resulted in satisfactory compromises.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Referring to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts concerning long-range bombers, would this item include the B-52 and B-58 bombers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would include the B-52. As the Senate construed long-range bombers, it would include the B-52.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I correctly understand that the proposed legislation does not include a hospital recommended in California?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That item is not involved in this bill at all. This bill relates to military hardware. The House has not yet agreed to the conference report on the military construction bill, which contains the item to which the Senator from California refers.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, after giving serious and detailed study to the 1961 omnibus housing bill, I have decided to vote against it even though I have consistently supported constructive legislation in the areas of Federal assistance for slum clearance, housing for the elderly, veterans' home loans, and additional public housing units.

S. 1922, despite certain helpful changes made during this debate, is too expansive for me in good conscience to support—too expansive in cost, in the numerous and far-reaching areas of life it plunges into, and in the extent to which it interferes with our free enterprise system. Urban renewal, for instance, should be extended but not by so much as the $4.5 billion capital grant authorization proposed in the bill. This amount is approximately double what I believe can be efficiently absorbed by our economy and effectively utilized by the cities responsible for carrying out the overall urban renewal programs.

Likewise, I believe the 100,000 new public housing units supplied in the bill are excessive. Testimony before the subcommittee demonstrated that the Nation's public housing program cannot helpfully accommodate additional public housing units at a level much above 37,000 units. As of March 31, 1961, there were 51,353 units still in the pipeline, and administration testimony has stated that current applications for public housing units are coming in at only a fraction of the number of units authorized. Statistics also show that housing construction is proceeding at a reasonably satisfactory rate of 1.2 million units a year, and that vacancies in rental units have now increased up to 8 percent.

I am generally disturbed by the no-downpayment, no-equity approach of Federal assistance to home buyers and homeowners, even though the original 40-year, no-downpayment loans available under the Housing for the Moderate Income Family title was amended to require a $555 downpayment. Other provisions in the bill give both encouragement and authority to this general philosophy, which fails to properly stress personal responsibility on the part of the mortgagor.

The "below-market-interest-rate" section of the measure is both economically unsound and seriously meddles with the principles of a free market system. There is serious doubt that private mortgage funds would be invested under this provision. The bill itself provides for an additional authorization of $750 million in Federal funds, admitting the potential of a persistent and unpredictable drain on public funds because of this financing technique.

I regret having to vote against this bill and have supported amendments on the Senate floor which would have provided for a more practical and economically feasible program in the field of housing and community development. I cannot support a housing measure, however, which is patently inflationary; which disregards the realities of current experience with housing programs across the country; which discourages financial effort and responsibility on the part of the individual; which undercuts the crucial role of private industry in homebuilding; and which in its own financing provisions fails to include both the discipline required when dealing with the taxpayer's money and the dedication to basic principles essential to the continuing of our free enterprise economy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, in view of the fact that this is a large bill, one of the largest, I think, that has ever been passed in the housing field, and there is some question about the extent of support which it will have on this side of the aisle, and in view of the fact that I intend to support the bill, I think it proper to state my reasons.

I believe the bill should be passed, for three reasons. First, except probably for civil rights, it represents, in my view, one of the greatest affirmations of the ability of our internal institutions, in terms of the cold war, upon which we have the opportunity to vote.

The fundamental difference which everyone finds between the Communist system and our system invariably boils down, in practical terms of day-to-day living, to housing, where we have a tremendous force for good, but the Communists have not been able to handle that problem.

Madam President, it is not insignificant— and I take into consideration the very important points made by the Senator from Illinois—that homeownership in the United States is now in the hands of approximately 60 percent of the American people—a great increase since World War II. This is a most important fact, and is one of the most critical things I know of in connection with our work for freedom.

Second, the entire FHA system, which this bill buttresses, constitutes one of the most important factors in connection with our work for freedom. For the reasons pointed out, private efforts in connection with this industry cannot stand alone. The private building industry might be able to take care of two-thirds of the homes needed, or a little more; but the difference between that amount and the 1,250,000 a year is essential to the growth of our society; and that is provided for in the pending bill, and is indispensable.

I believe the entire FHA system is an intelligent way to weld government credit into the private industry activities, and needs to be supported.

Third, Madam President, the bill is not inflationary, because anyone who has run a business knows that what counts is not only what one owes, but also what one has. Our Government owes $300 billion, in round figures, but we also have

an enormously rich country, worth at the very least $800 billion, and perhaps a trillion dollars, or perhaps even more.

When homes are built, they add to the assets and resources of the country; and this bill will add many fold to the number of houses, because individual owners will develop their homes, will embelish them, will furnish them, will use them, will add automobiles to them, and will have greater incentive to work harder, and thus will add to the wealth of the country.

So, Madam President, for all these reasons—notwithstanding my unhappiness and my dissatisfaction over the fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have again, I believe—and I say this advisedly—for more partisan reasons than they had any right to, foregone the best middle-income housing provision; and I hope and believe that as time passes they will come to the conclusion that the way to handle best the middle-income housing is the way we have urged, not the 40-year basis—I shall vote for the bill anyway, because I believe that in a situation of this sort it is essential.

Madam President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for allowing to remain in the bill the provision which gives the Administrator the right to reduce the charge for the FHA program from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent. This provision has within it the seeds of enormous saving, and it can be of great benefit in confirming the fact that the FHA has been profitable and has accumulated large reserves, which should be passed on to the consumers. I am also very grateful to the Senator from Indiana for not pressing for the adoption of an amendment which might very well have changed that part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding this time to me. I shall complete the statement of my views in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New York for his statement.

Madam President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, there are today, despite some improvement in our economy, almost 5 million Americans who are unemployed. This condition of our economy makes it imperative that the Government have a vigorous housing program. In addition to that, our social objectives—the desire to promote homeownership, the desire to promote urban renewal and other worthwhile objectives dealt with in the bill—make it imperative that the Congress enact a housing bill. Without the enactment of a housing bill, all FHA home-loan guarantees would terminate this year. Without the enactment of a housing bill, the urban renewal program would come to a halt, and so would college housing and other worthwhile programs which have the wholehearted endorsement of the people.

Madam President, my efforts to modify the pending bill by means of amendments had one objective only—namely, improvement of the bill. I succeeded only in part. Obviously, therefore, there are retained in the bill provisions with which I disagree. Indeed, the chairman of the subcommittee has told the Senate that the bill contains provisions with which he disagreed in the committee, and with which he still disagrees.

Madam President, I have concluded to support the bill, despite its imperfections. I support the bill because of its economic necessity, because the heart and core of the pending bill are not the innovations with which I disagree but rather the continuations of the programs which have proven successful over the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Madam President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President——

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President——

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee on his statement, and I join him in it. I supported the Senator from Tennessee in his efforts to eliminate the 40-year, no-downpayment provision. He succeeded in some measure, and I congratulate him for that. I believe he has improved the bill.

The bill contains some provisions of which I do not approve. However, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that we must have a housing program going forward. I know of no program assisted by the Government that does more to build up our middle-class society and conservatism than does homeownership, and certainly I would not want to vote against the bill and thus have that program brought to an end.

So I am happy to associate myself with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Florida for his generosity and for his contribution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, until the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] rose to his feet a few minutes ago and addressed the Senate, we had been listening, here on the floor of the Senate, for most of the afternoon, to the voice of the past, in my opinion—the voice of an age which has gone.

I am happy to note that in a few minutes the Senate will, without question, vote to support the needs of the present and the needs of the future, the needs which our people will encounter in the age which lies ahead, rather than to concentrate upon the dead past.

This is the best housing bill which has come before the Senate during my brief service here.

The bill contains provisions for at least nine major measures of great improvement.

The bill has for the first time a really effective moderate-income housing program, with provision for 40-year loans, with a small downpayment, fully insured, which, although it will knock out—because of the downpayment—such opportunities for 2 million American families of moderate income, still will leave 9 million such families available for this badly needed program, in order to give them a decent roof over their heads.

Second, the home improvement and rehabilitation program has been very much stepped up, with a limit of $10,000 on the loans and 20 years for their repayment.

Third, the bill contains material provisions for the encouragement of advanced technology in connection with home building.

Fourth, the bill provides for the program of housing for the elderly; the bill will refurbish and improve that program.

Fifth, the bill provides a splendid step forward in authorizing almost 100,000 additional units of public housing, including special provisions for the disabled and the elderly.

Sixth, the bill proceeds at long last to place urban renewal on a long-term basis, so that metropolitan areas and cities can plan for the future.

A number of other very important improvements have been made in the urban renewal program.

Seventh, the college housing program has at last been put on a long-term basis, with an authorization of $250 million for 5 years.

Eighth, mass transportation has been recognized as a problem of urban renewal, when merged with community facilities, and given money to get underway. Treasury borrowing has been provided as a method of financing the program.

Ninth, and last, the Federal National Mortgage Association has been financed with additional funds and the general FHA program has been extended for a period of 2 more years.

This bill makes a long stride forward toward the goal laid down for the first time in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act of 1939 of a decent home for every American family.

I could not conclude without expressing my appreciation to two splendid

members of the minority, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], without whose votes many parts of this bill would have been wrecked.

I also express my appreciation to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], whose votes on critical amendments were needed to protect a worthwhile program.

We are about to pass a first-class housing bill, and I shall support it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, this bill illustrates a constantly occurring legislative situation. The bill before the Senate contains provisions which I think are wise. It likewise has provisions in it which I think are foolish. It has provisions in it which I think are sound. It likewise has provisions in it which I think are unsound.

If one were to wait to vote for a piece of major legislation until he found one which he thought was perfect, he would never cast an affirmative vote.

Notwithstanding my convictions that certain provisions of this bill are foolish and unwise, I think on the whole the good in the bill far outweighs the bad. For that reason I expect to vote for it on final passage.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Under the provisions of the act now in existence, preference was given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I note, under the report of the committee, under section 206, the section of the bill relating to admission policy, has been amended supposedly to give localities greater flexibility in shaping admission policy. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes that, under the bill as it now stands and which is before us for passage, the local admission agency would be permitted to establish a preference criteria, for example, for an airman, or an airman first class, or other military personnel, presuming they came within the income provision of the law, and give them a priority basis.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say to the Senator from Nevada that it is my interpretation of the provision that we wrote into the bill it does that very thing. The Senator has correctly read from the report, in which we call attention to the fact that it leaves the provision as it is and gives the local authority greater flexibility.

If he will refer to the bill, section 206, starting on page 39, and running over onto page 40, he will see, at the beginning of the section starting on line 21 on page 39, and running over to line 5 on the next page, it specifically refers to servicemen. In other words, it brings him in the same category as a veteran. The next paragraph relates to the income level. So if the serviceman comes within the income level, then he is eligible for the housing.

Mr. CANNON. The local agency could establish priority?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The local agency could establish regulations governing priority.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota notes with interest that the provision for making grants for mass transportation demonstration projects in an amount not exceeding $50 million differs somewhat from the capital grants that are proposed for urban renewal and redevelopment in paragraph (a) of section 103, and would like to know what the reason is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am trying to look at the report now.

To what page in the report does the Senator refer?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am looking at page 4 of the 1949 act; but, briefly, the situation is that paragraph (a) of section 103 authorizes capital grants for development. The last sentence of paragraph (b) provides that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all capital grants, which would cover those grants. But the new sentence provided by section 103 of the clean print of the bill does not refer to these grants for mass transportation demonstration projects as capital grants.

So, I must assume the language that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of capital grants does not refer to the $50 million for mass transportation demonstration projects.

I make this point because I think it should be clear in the legislative history of the bill that the Appropriations Committee will not be under the same compulsion with respect to the $50 million for the mass transportation demonstration projects that it would be with respect to providing funds for capital grants made under the terms and concept of paragraph (a) of section 103.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say to the Senator from South Dakota that I am sorry the Senator from New Jersey is not present on the floor, since this is a project which he handled. It was a project which I opposed in the committee, not because I was opposed to it as a program, but because I felt the demonstration proposal would be much wiser if it was brought before us after experts had a chance to study it and it could come in with its own recommendations in January. Nevertheless, the majority of the committee put the provision in the bill.

As I said in the colloquy with the distinguished minority leader earlier in the afternoon, every Republican on the committee voted for it. It was a bipartisan matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield myself 1 minute. It is my opinion—this is only my opinion; I shall be very glad to have our staff check into it and give the Senator from South Dakota a memorandum later, if he wants it—that there is no distinction between this grant authorization and that provided in the act of 1949.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would have to challenge that as a part of the legislative history, because in 1949 in the House of Representatives I raised a point of order as to funds obtained for the loan section of the bill, contending it constituted an appropriation. Here we have a different situation. The grant section was made dependent upon appropriations, and the Appropriations Committee is respected and named. But the sentence which is not amended by the bill is the second sentence of (b) of section 103, which pledges the faith of the United States only to the payment of capital grants.

I invite attention to the fact that the portion relating to $50 million does not specify capital grants but relates only to grants in a general way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the question.

This action of the bill provides for contract authority to make capital grants.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The word "capital" does not appear.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I state again that in my opinion there is no distinction between the "grants" provided for under the 1961 bill and those provided for in the act of 1949.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I must point out that the old sentence 1 referred to "capital grants" and the new sentence 1 for paragraph (b) which is provided by the amendment does not refer to "capital grants," but refers to "grants" in a general way. The reference to mass transportation is only to "grants" and not to "capital grants." Therefore, I hope the Appropriations Committee will take due notice that it is not under the same compulsion with respect to the $50 million for mass transportation demonstration projects as it might be with respect to other items in section 103.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, in consideration of the Housing Act of 1959, Mr. Norman Mason, the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, testified before the committee that the use of the word "capital" was not necessary. The amendments submitted that year revised the wording under section 103(b), deleting all reference to "capital grants" and replaced them with "grants".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I shall take only a few minutes to summarize the items relating to the bill. I shall mention only a few.

I am sorry that my friend the minority leader is not in the Chamber at this time. He talked about the veterans' direct loan program. This has been one of the most popular, yet relatively small programs we have had in the whole country. The Senator said it would snowball. As a matter of fact, it has been going for 11 years and has not snowballed.

The thing which perhaps the Senator overlooks is that there is a definite cutoff provided in the bill. We are phasing that program out and also phasing out the GI guarantee program. Those features are both carried in the bill, and I think they should be accepted with pleasure by Senators generally.

A statement has been made that this is the largest housing bill ever. That may be true; I do not know. This is the first time we have ever considered a bill which carried provisions for several years of the program. The Senate has, at times, passed bills for long periods. We passed a bill providing 6 years of urban renewal, but that was never agreed to.

The bill before us provides for a program of urban renewal with the time not limited, but the administration has suggested it would take 4 years to carry out the program. There is a 5-year farm program in the bill. There is a long-term college loan program in the bill. There are many other long-term programs. When we add up the total, including all of the years the program would run, the amount involved becomes quite large.

There is one thing I wish to say for the many people who are still disturbed about the 40-year limitation. I repeat what I have said many times: This is nothing new. I wager that very few Senators in the Chamber realize that one of the old, reliable sections of the FHA program is section 207, the standard rental program. That program has had 40-year mortgages since 1951.

In addition, there are 40-year programs under section 213, section 220, section 221, section 231, and section 232. There has been a remarkable showing as we have seen from our experience under section 213.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the FHA 40-year mortgage programs showing the loss experience on FHA 40-year sales housing programs, including FHA section 221 housing for displaced families, and FHA section 213 cooperative housing.

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

FHA 40-YEAR MORTGAGES

Existing law permits FHA to insure mortgages on a 40-year repayment basis as follows:

1. SALES HOUSING

Section 221—housing for displaced families, 40-year mortgages first authorized by law in 1956.

Section 213—cooperative housing, first authorized in 1950.

(See next page for default experience under these programs.)

2. RENTAL HOUSING

All multifamily housing insured by FHA are in practice on long-term basis of over 39 years. This includes rental housing under sections 207, 213, 220, 221, 231, and 232. Sections 213 and 221 place a statutory limit of 40 years or three-fourths of the remaining economic life of the property on the term of loan. The other sections of the law permit the FHA Commissioner to set the maximum term and he has set the 39-year term.

LOSS EXPERIENCE ON FHA 40-YEAR SALES HOUSING PROGRAMS

(a) FHA Section 221: Housing for Displaced Families.—Total loans insured, 24,000 for $218 million. Mortgages defaulted and acquired by FHA, 454 mortgages for $4 million.

Experience on resale of FHA acquired section 221 mortgaged property shows that the average dollar loss per property is $1,150. (Based on sale of 70 properties to date which were sold at a loss of $80,000.)

If all 454 defaulted properties were to be sold at the same average loss as the first 70 properties, the total loss would be $520,000, or .22 percent of the total amount insured.

(b) FHA Section 213: Cooperative Housing.—Total loans insured, 28,500 for $334 million. Mortgages defaulted and acquired by FHA, 95 mortgages for $1,266,000.

Experience on resale of FHA acquired section 213 properties shows that the average dollar loss per property is about $1,500. (Based on sale of 48 properties to date which show a total loss of about $75,000.)

If all 95 properties were to be sold at the same average loss as the first 48, the total loss would be less than $150,000, or .05 percent of the total amount insured.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the claims experienced on VA-guaranteed home loans, and also a table connected therewith showing the incidence of claims on primary GI home loans, by years the mortgage has run. I ask Senators to remember that these are no-downpayment mortgages for the most part.

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

CLAIMS EXPERIENCED ON VA-GUARANTEED HOME LOANS

A special study of claims experience on VA-guaranteed primary home loans for home purchase from the beginning of the program in 1944 through June 1957 revealed the following:

	Number guaranteed	Claims paid	
		Number	Percent of number guaranteed
Downpayment loans	3,096,062	13,401	0.43
No downpayment loans	1,190,723	12,642	1.06
Total primary loans for home purchase	4,286,785	26,043	.61

The attached table contains the incidence of claim payments in the life of the loans. In making this study, loans on which claims were paid were grouped by year of loan origination and the elapsed time between the origin and date of claim payment was computed. With very little variation from year to year, the highest incidence of claim payments occurred during the early life of the loans—usually between 1½ and 3½ years after the loans were made. It will be noted that the incidence of claim payments declines rapidly after the first 3 or 4 years in the life of the mortgages.

Incidence of claims on primary GI home loans

Elapsed time after loan was guaranteed:	*Claims paid as percent of loans guaranteed*
Less than 6 months	0.004
6 months to 1 year	.021
1 to 1½ years	.075
1½ to 2 years	.105
2 to 2½ years	.107
2½ to 3 years	.100
3 to 3½ years	.088
3½ to 4 years	.075
4 to 4½ years	.062
4½ to 5 years	.052
5 to 5½ years	.043
5½ to 6 years	.039
6 to 6½ years	.035
6½ to 7 years	.028
7 to 7½ years	.025
7½ to 8 years	.020
8 to 8½ years	.017
8½ to 9 years	.019
9 to 9½ years	.017
9½ to 10 years	.017
10 to 10½ years	.002

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table relating to the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, covering the time it has been operating.

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

FNMA is a profitable enterprise. On its combined operations its earnings or accumulated net income as of December 31, 1960, is $414 million. These earnings are distributed as follows:

[Millions]

Dividends paid on preferred stock	$10.7
Dividends paid on common stock	4.4
Surplus and earnings paid to U.S. Government	164.4
Reserves and undistributed surplus	234.5
Total	414.0

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended, and that I may have not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I do not wish to have anyone think I am casting any reflection upon anybody, but to my mind the bill before us is the best example in the world as to why nations go socialistic. We are constantly asked to liberalize and to liberalize, to eat away the private enterprise system. In my opinion the bill

before us is one of the reasons why other nations throughout the world are losing confidence in the United States, because we talk one way and act another.

We tried to amend the bill in many directions. In some we succeeded, and in others we did not. The bill provides a lot of little things to which I refer as "cats and dogs."

Senators would be amazed, if they would take the time to study the bill carefully, to learn the number of little ways in which the bill has been liberalized. Therein lies the danger in the bill.

I shall vote against the bill, because that is the only way I can protest against taking what has been a good piece of proposed legislation and misusing it by liberalizing it to the point that, if we do not stop, some day we may well nationalize the housing industry of the United States. That is a reason why Senators ought to vote against the bill.

Another reason why Senators ought to vote against the bill is that there has not been a Senator who has spoken on the bill who has not said there are some things he likes about it and other things he dislikes about it. There has not been a single Senator who has been 100 percent satisfied with the proposed legislation.

I hope Senators will believe me when I say that this is a real example of what happens to governments and to legislative bodies which do not have the courage to stop liberalizing good legislation so that some day they reach the point of wrecking the program. In my opinion, some day we shall wreck the FHA program.

Senators should read the bill carefully. They ought to read the fine print. The bill would give to the Federal Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, whoever he may be and whatever his policies may be, power beyond the point each and every Senator would oppose, if Senators realized how much power the bill would give the Federal Administrator.

I plead with the Senate. I know we shall not succeed in stopping the passage of the bill. I know that the bill will be passed. Ever since I first came to the U.S. Senate I have supported FHA legislation. I wish I could support the present measure. However, I shall cast a protest vote against the constant increasing liberality contained in bills such as the pending bill, which, in my opinion, tend to bring us down the road of socialism. It would be very easy to advocate building a house for every person in the United States. Our opposition would so provide. But how, in good conscience, can we continue to vote for such proposed legislation as we are asked to vote upon today, and at the same time constantly appropriate money to stop the progress of socialism and communism in other countries? Constantly we go farther forward into socialism. We place the government further and further into the lives of the American people and further and further into the private enterprise system. One could not in good conscience vote for the proposed legislation if he were opposed to socializing American industry. The really bad elements of the proposed legislation are little things, such as the authority, power, and control proposed to be given the administrator. Amendments were not offered to correct such things because such amendments could not be offered. The big weakness of the bill lies at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. PROUTY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

If present and voting the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 77]

YEAS—64

Aiken	Gruening	Metcalf
Anderson	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Moss
Beall	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickey	Neuberger
Boggs	Hill	Pastore
Burdick	Humphrey	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Javits	Randolph
Carroll	Johnston	Scott
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Smathers
Church	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Dodd	Kuchel	Symington
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Engle	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Magnuson	Yarborough
Fong	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	
Gore	McNamara	

NAYS—25

Allott	Dirksen	Robertson
Bennett	Dworshak	Russell
Butler	Eastland	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Stennis
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Thurmond
Carlson	Holland	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Miller	
Curtis	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—11

Blakley	Hruska	Morton
Bridges	Lausche	Prouty
Bush	Mansfield	Schoeppel
Chavez	Morse	

So the bill (S. 1922) was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary may be authorized to make certain technical and other changes of a purely clerical nature in engrossing the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, it is only proper at this time to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill which has just been passed by the Senate, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He has shown rare managerial capacity. Certainly he had full and complete knowledge of the bill before us. I salute him. I wish also to salute and express my thanks to the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] who fought a hard, clean fight in trying to bring about changes in the bill which he thought were right and proper.

I believe that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], whose amendment was adopted, likewise is entitled to great credit for what he did, which, in effect, made the bill stronger

than it was when it was first presented to the Senate.

I express my thanks to the members of the committee handling the legislation and to the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle, as well as to all other Senators, for the kindness, courtesy, and consideration shown.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I express my thanks to all the members of the committee on the minority side. This is one of the most bewildering bills I have ever seen. I know that it required a rare degree of patience and sustained effort to understand and explain not only the bill, but also the very perplexing amendments that were before us. I salute them for their excellent efforts, even though we did not agree with respect to some of them.

CONTINENTAL HOSIERY MILLS, INC., HENDERSON, N.C.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, while a number of Senators are in the Chamber, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader what is the program for the remainder of the day and what is planned for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I first move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 322, S. 1206, for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). 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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, next, it is the intention of the leadership to bring up the Menominee Indian bill today. Tomorrow, it is proposed to begin consideration of the nominations of Messrs, Joseph C. Swidler and Howard Morgan to be members of the Federal Power Commission.

After that, the Senate will take up the highway tax bill, which has been reported by both the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Finance. It is anticipated that the Senate may be able to start debating that bill tomorrow, although that will depend on the length of debate on the nominations of Messrs. Swidler and Morgan. At any rate, it is hoped that the Senate can begin the debate of the highway tax bill not later than Wednesday. It is hoped that it may be finished within a couple of days.

If that is the case, toward the end of the week the Senate will give consideration to Calendar 176, S. 1185, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses; Calendar No. 177, S. 1183, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; and Calendar 283, S. 1430, for the relief of Terez Kaszap.

If, however, those bills are arranged in such form as to be considered only late on Friday, they will not be considered on that day, but will go over until the following week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my understanding is also that on Thursday the first order of business will be the investiture of the very distinguished Senator-elect from Texas, Mr. JOHN TOWER.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The first order of business, either before or after the conclusion of the morning hour, will be the "investiture" of the new Senator from Texas. I assure the Senate that the Vice President will be here to do the honors in person.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust there will be a full attendance of the Senate membership on Thursday, because while we shall be paying tribute to JOHN TOWER, we shall also be paying tribute to the perspicacity and discernment of the electorate of the great unfrozen State of Texas, the largest unfrozen State in the Union.

If it could be contrived within the rules of the Senate, I wish we could bring in an orchestra to play "The Yellow Rose of Texas."

Mr. MANSFIELD. We could hum it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the distinguished majority leader give us any assurance concerning the possibility of considering proposed legislation at an early date which will probably have as its objective the increasing of Federal revenue with which to finance the increasing multibillion dollar spending in which we are now engaged? Or will that be relegated to the discard until late next year, too late for action in the next session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Idaho in detail; but if any request is made for appropriations to construct the Kootenai project in northern Idaho, the Senator may rest assured that it will receive immediate consideration.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is very sincere. I have read some of the messages sent to Congress by the Chief Executive, pointing out that throughout the world the United States is assuming greater responsibility for providing increased foreign aid, military aid, and economic aid for countries everywhere. It is considered to be almost certain that in the coming fiscal year this Government will be facing a deficit of probably $5 billion. I am certain the distinguished majority leader knows that we cannot continue to accentuate these inflationary threats without jeopardizing the security of the country.

We talk about national survival. Are we so completely complacent and indifferent to the demands for maintaining a budget which will not weaken our economic structure that we will bankrupt our country?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want the Senator from Idaho to know that I really appreciate the seriousness with which he raises the question.

Frankly, I do not know the answer to the question he has raised. However, tomorrow the Senate will begin the consideration of the highway tax bill, which will call for increases in revenues. There will be other proposals, such as an increase in postal rates, which will come before Congress, I hope, before the first session ends, so that we can face up to our responsibility at least in those two respects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that the two distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. PROXMIRE] have a particular interest in the Menominee Indian bill, and that there is some conflict of opinion. I should like to inquire how long the Senators from Wisconsin expect to address themselves to the bill and whether it is proposed to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my expectation to speak for about 10 minutes. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

PROPOSED ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the request I am about to make is made after discussion with the distinguished minority leader.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object to the request of the Senator from Montana.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees of the Senate may meet until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINENTAL HOSIERY MILLS, INC., HENDERSON, N.C.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Calendar No. 322, Senate bill 1206, for the relief of Continental Hoisery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., is merely a bill to refund an overpayment of tax.

I have before me a prepared statement showing the circumstances under which the claim arose and its merits. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

This bill would pay to Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., the sum of $21,670.11, representing a refund of income tax erroneously collected from said corporation on April 19, 1947.

Legislation accomplishing the same purpose of this bill was passed by both Houses in the 85th Congress but was vetoed by the President. Similar legislation was again passed by the Senate in the 86th Congress but no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

In April of 1947 the Internal Revenue Service made deficiency assessments for income and excess profits taxes covering the period April 30, 1942, through April 30, 1945, arising from excessive salaries paid to officers of the corporation. The contract or agreement fixing the salaries involved was approved by the Salary Stabilization Board of the Treasury Department on December 9, 1943, and was never questioned after its first approval. The Treasury Department bases its adverse report upon the fact that no claim for refund or appeal was taken during the required statutory period, and further points out that the claimant executed a waiver of restriction on the assessment. The committee is of the opinion, however, that the circumstances under which this consent or waiver was obtained should be taken into consideration. A representative of the Bureau went to the home of an officer of the corporation, where he was recuperating from surgery, and obtained his signature to the waiver or consent. The officer was not aware of the company's right of appeal but, on the contrary, was under the impression that there was no alternative but to sign in order to prevent a lien being filed against the company's assets. It was not until after the running of the statutory period that the claimant company learned of its right of appeal.

It is noted that during the period in question the officer had paid individual income taxes on his salary, and the combined tax paid by him and the corporation on the amount disallowed as salaries is more than $8,000 greater than the portions of salaries involved. Thus the Government was unjustly enriched by this overpayment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The bill (S. 1206) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, 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 the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $21,670.11 to Continental Hosiery Mills, Incorporated, of Henderson, North Carolina, successor to Continental Hosiery Company, of Henderson, North Carolina, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, representing a refund of income tax erroneously collected from said corporation on April 19, 1947, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this contract shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an excellent article which appeared in the New York Times magazine of yesterday, June 11, by David E. Lilienthal, entitled "Why Nigeria Is Different," as well as a New York Times editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "Debate on Foreign Aid."

I point out that over the week end I said over the television that I hoped the American people, including my own colleagues on the Republican side, would follow up their indignation over what is wrong with foreign aid, but give their support for a long-term foreign aid. Like many others, I think much needs to be done, and I will make practical recommendations as to how it should be handled. But foreign aid must continue. It is one of the most urgent arms of our foreign policy. If we fail to support foreign aid, we are going to fight the struggle with the Russians with one hand tied behind our back. We cannot win that way.

I hope we will devote our efforts to making the foreign aid program better, rather than cutting it to ribbons in financial terms, because it means money, or back away from it altogether.

Mr. President, against the background of the emerging nations of Africa, there can be seen the tremendous benefits which could accrue to the free world through an effective and adequate long-term foreign-aid program. These new nations need the means to establish decent living standards, educate their people, build up a reliable civil service system and develop a strong viable economy. Their problems are many and complex. Multiracial and tribal considerations are among the obstacles that must be overcome on the way to a unified society. But with proper help, this new continental giant can become the new frontier of the free world, where progress can be made the democratic way. Nigeria is one of the show places of what can be done by the Africans under enlightened auspices and also an indication of what still needs to be done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by David E. Lilienthal, entitled "Why Nigeria Is Different," which appeared in the New York Times magazine June 11, and the editorial headed, "Debate on Foreign Aid," which appeared in the New York Times, June 12.

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

[From the New York Times magazine, June 12, 1961]

WHY NIGERIA IS DIFFERENT

(By David E. Lilienthal)

The news from the Congo, Angola, Kenya, the Union of South Africa naturally leads many Westerners to think of Africa as a place of bloodshed, chaos, racial bitterness, warring tribal factions—indeed, as a threat to the continued existence of the United Nations. But it would be a grave error to concentrate solely on the problems and crises of the new Africa, and thereby to ignore its affirmative, hopeful opportunities.

Africa is a land of great opportunities, and in their realization lies the best hope of ameliorating the problems. Among the countries that represent this hopeful aspect is Nigeria, the most populous nation on the continent.

There are two chief reasons for optimism over Nigeria:

First, the progress Nigeria has made in the art and practice of responsible government. For this, some of the credit must go to enlightened British leadership in the years preceding Nigeria's accession to independence within the Commonwealth last October 1. Under British and mission-school tutelage, Nigerians spent a generation in building their own trained and competent civil service.

The second is the fact that Nigeria's leaders are ambitious not for political dominance over the rest of tropical Africa, but for the development of their own country's vast resources. Chief among these is the Niger River; in the fullest use of the waters of that great stream and its tributaries lies the key to the economic and political future of this huge land and its more than 40 million people.

To understand Nigeria's achievements, even this early, in self-government, one must recall the kind of nation it is. Not unlike America, Nigeria is highly diverse—not only geographically but religiously (about half the population is Islamic; the balance is either Christian or has traditional West African religious beliefs), ethnically (there are some 250 distinct tribal groups) and linguistically (scores of dialects are spoken). In addition, there are scores of tribal leaders whose secular or religious authority has ancient and deeply honored cultural foundations.

Welding these diverse forces into a single nation is a task that would exact the highest statecraft of a people with centuries, not merely decades, of experience in political democracy. The Nigerians have chosen federal union as did America's Founding Fathers almost 200 years ago. There are three states: the eastern, western, and northern regions. (The Federal Parliament recently voted to carve a fourth, the midwest region, out of the western.) Each region, and the Federal Government, has its own duly elected Parliament, Prime Minister and Cabinet, its own administrative service, its own judiciary.

An evolving instinct for accommodation—the heart of democratic self-government—has been evidenced in many ways. For example, a distinguished Nigerian, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, was recently elected Federal Prime Minister. He is a Moslem from the northern region, a section almost as different from the western and eastern regions as New York is from Argentina or Morocco.

His defeated opponent, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe of eastern region, an extraordinarily popular man, thereupon accepted the honorific post of Governor-General—i.e., the Queen's representative and Head of State—thus voluntarily placing himself outside politics for an indefinite period.

The opposition is now headed by Obafemi Awolowo, scholarly, precise, a kind of Woodrow Wilson in Yoruba robes. This is no tame-bear opposition, yet the decorum and content of debate in Parliament compare favorably with those of many legislative bodies I have observed in other nations—my own included—where such institutions have a much longer history.

As in Britain, cabinet ministers are chosen from men who have been elected to Parliament. Thus they must be active politicians as well as administrators. They include men of exceptional talents. For example, the Minister of Economic Development, Jaja Wachuku, is widely admired in Britain and in the United Nations, as well as at home, for the range of his capabilities. The Minister of Mines and Power, Mallam Maitama Sule, strikes me as being among the best-informed and most clearheaded public servants I have ever met.

Another measure of capacity for self-government is the quality of the ministries' nonpolitical administrative offices—the "permanent civil servants," as they are called in the British parlance used in Nigeria. A few still are Britons, like E. G. Lewis, the farsighted Permanent Secretary for Economic Development. Most are Nigerians.

One day in Ibadan, capital of the western region, I was invited to attend one of the regular meetings of the dozen or so permanent secretaries of the region, all Nigerians. They spoke of their several responsibilities—education, health, economic development, etc.—with admirable brevity and clarity. The questions they put to me had an engaging and almost startling directness and candor (this directness is the rule, I found, among Nigerians of all classes). As one who has spent most of his adult life in public service, I can testify that this group knows the business of government.

But self-government requires more than competence and dedication at the top. In the final analysis, it calls for certain qualities among the rank-and-file of the people themselves. On my trips throughout the country I saw happy people who treat each other—and their visitors—with friendly smiles and gentleness and natural, simple courtesy. These are among the very human qualities that make the trying tasks of self-government manageable.

As important as Nigeria's demonstration of a evolving capacity to govern itself is the top priority its leaders have placed on development of its natural resources. Here is where, in Nigerian eyes, the Niger River and its tributaries figure so conspicuously.

The Niger—the "black river"—is one of the longest in the world. It rises on the northerly slopes of the mountains of Guinea, near the great bulge of West Africa, and flows in a sweeping arc for 2,600 miles through the Republic of Mali (until recently the French Sudan of Foreign Legion fame), past the fabled city of Timbuktu, through the new Republic of Niger and across Nigeria to the Atlantic Ocean.

Its silt-laden waters for part of its course are truly black—not brown like the Missouri or the middle Mississippi. Before they reach Timbuktu, they sprawl out into a chain of shallow lakes and marshes, called, oddly, the delta of the upper Niger. For miles they flow through desert, with sand dunes on either side. For stretches, they churn through labyrinths of rocks and rapids.

Across the northern region of Nigeria, the river courses slowly and majestically between low banks. The flat, treeless savanna stretches away on both sides, sere in the dry season. Tributaries—the Benue and the Kaduna—join the main stream and the Niger flows more broadly. In flood, it spreads implacably across the scrub land and through the rain forest of its lower reaches, before it breaks up into the twisting channels and sodden mangrove swamps of its vast final delta.

For some years, both before and since independence, detailed hydrologic and engineering and economic studies have been made of the lower Niger's potentialities. I read these reports during my recent stay. In tone, their impersonal massing of facts and estimates could have been concerned with any underdeveloped river anywhere. They took on life when Minister Sule, the gleam in his eyes reminding me of Senator Norris in the early days of the TVA, told me what he and his colleagues conceive as their meaning to Nigeria:

"Electricity at low cost is the heart of our plans for the industrial development of this nation, and the raising of our people's living standards, throughout the cities and villages of this land. The power from the Niger is our answer."

Electricity means pumps for wells in villages where women and children now carry all drinking water on their heads for long distances, refrigeration to provide better use of food and better health, light for the new readers produced by the spread of education, local industries in rural villages now wholly dependent on farming.

The dams and reservoirs that development would bring would mean water for thirsty land, providing ample forage for cattle now gaunt during the long dry season of the north; flood control for downstream farmers, assuring them their crops will not be washed away; a navigable waterway opening great reaches of what is now back country to barges and even oceangoing vessels.

These changes could within half a generation transform the lives of Nigerians and—conceivably—of their neighbors along the Niger's upper reaches.

Engineers' plans call for a first dam at a site known as Kainji, 100 miles north of Jebba. The Kainji Dam, a project estimated to cost somewhat less than $200 million, ultimately would have a capacity of nearly 1 million kilowatts. It would be only the first step in a chain of water control structures of the entire lower Niger system.

The concept of full development of the lower Niger River is no longer a dream. A detailed Federal Ministry of Development presentation is expected this month. Such problems as financing and organization—very difficult but solvable—are yet to be fully worked out, but the turning of the first shovel could be only months away. By 1966, if these first steps are well done, Nigeria will have taken a 7-league stride forward.

There are formidable obstacles to be overcome, of course. The task requires a high degree of coordination and management. Even the first steps require substantial amounts of capital above what Nigeria has available—probably as much as $150 million of external financing. The estimates for succeeding stages are not yet complete, but the sums will be large.

Where will Nigeria turn for such help as it feels it needs—technical, managerial, and financial? I do not think the assumption is far-fetched that Nigeria and the West, each in its own interest, would prefer that the aid come from the West rather than the Soviets. Both Nigeria and the West hold similar basic political ideas. And large as the sums will be, they will be less than the amounts that will be spent just to keep a modicum of order in the Congo, for example.

Furthermore, these capital outlays will be productive. I do not mean as a quid pro quo for friendship (that myth is happily about exploded), but productive in a more meaningful sense, productive for the people of Nigeria.

The direct physical benefits to Nigeria of the Niger development are by no means the only ones; there are indirect, nonmaterial benefits of the greatest significance.

Undertaking a task so large, one that calls for so many skills both of modern technology and of social change, sets up a goal, a national purpose, that can provide an authentic unifying force for a new nation. The challenge itself already has stirred national pride, and pride can be one of the most creative aspects of nationalism.

Moreover, the river's development invites understanding in the minds of Nigerians and of their African neighbors, of the interdependence of peoples, tribes and nations. This is indeed the beginning of political wisdom, and perhaps the best hope for ultimate peace in that troubled continent—or in the world, for that matter.

A demonstration of initiative by Nigeria in developing the lower Niger may well encourage later development programs by some of her sister new nations upstream. If this occurs, there may be an opportunity for the resulting benefits to be shared, just as Canada and the United States have agreed to share the benefits of future Canadian upstream development of the Columbia River. Thus, the Niger, as an international river, can furnish a politically stabilizing force among new nations.

Does the story of Nigeria hold the answer for the world of tropical Africa? Certainly not, but Nigeria does throw some light on possible steps toward the solution of tropical Africa's problems.

For one example, I suggest that Nigeria demonstrates there can be no real independence until, step by step, other new nations equip themselves with their own trained civil service administrations. Nothing of this sort can be built up overnight, of course, but an intensive start can and should be made.

The second major lesson Nigeria may have for others in Africa lies in the focusing of her attention on her own problems and potentialities. The Niger River plan illustrates one significant way of drawing a nation's people together through a mutually shared need for national cooperation.

The third major lesson—or potential lesson—is more for the West than for Africa. It is that we should more and more concentrate on opportunities, be less preoccupied with week-by-week emergencies of the newly developing world. Nigeria is a good example of such an opportunity.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1961]

DEBATE ON FOREIGN AID

Mounting indications that President Kennedy's foreign aid program is running into trouble in Congress suggest that a new look is needed at the debate on this matter.

The basic case for the foreign-aid program rests on two foundations. One is the moral obligation of our affluent society to share at least a small part of our great wealth with our poverty-stricken fellow human beings in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, who need help in making progress toward industrialization and improved living standards. The second foundation is the political imperative arising from the fact that all over the underdeveloped world Communist propaganda seeks to use the fertile ground provided by abject mass poverty to win power for communism.

Merely to state these basic propositions should make clear that foreign aid cannot be approached with the criteria a banker properly applies when considering a commercial loan.

The most controversial point is the request for authorization to borrow funds and commit them over a 5-year period. This has been assailed as back-door borrowing and as a move to deprive Congress of its power of the purse. Whether back-door or not, such borrowing has many precedents.

What is plainly evident is that the existing system which binds foreign-aid activity to short-term horizons, limited by annual congressional appropriations, has become inadequate. To make sense, a nation's development program, in which our assistance plays a part, must be based on long-term

planning and assured financing over a medium-term period. Our Communist opponents do not straitjacket themselves in this way in their competitive foreign-aid activities, and we can no longer afford such archaic limitations.

The critics of foreign aid make much of past mistakes and of the fact that previous foreign aid has not automatically solved all our problems in the underdeveloped nations. Mistakes in such a relatively new and complex field as foreign aid are inevitable, and provide the bases for correction and improvement. Though our problems in some underdeveloped countries are huge, critics should consider how much more severe and widespread those problems would be—in South Korea, South Vietnam, Taiwan, India, and elsewhere—if it were not for American aid.

The least comprehensible objection is that this Nation cannot afford the foreign-aid program. The fact is that the total foreign-aid appropriation the President has requested is less than 1 percent of our Nation's total annual output. It is difficult to take seriously the notion that a society such as ours, which is now producing at substantially less than full capacity, cannot afford for a vital aspect of the struggle for freedom's survival less than one penny out of every dollar's worth of goods and services it produces.

U.S. PROPAGANDA NEEDS A NEW FRONTIER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "U.S. Propaganda Needs a New Frontier," written by Mr. Henry Mayers and published in the Advertising Age, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

This article reminds us that the Soviet challenge calls for more aggressive counterstrategy if freedom is to survive and gain new friends.

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

U.S. PROPAGANDA NEEDS A NEW FRONTIER; SOVIET CHALLENGE CALLS FOR MORE AGGRESSIVE COUNTERSTRATEGY

(By Henry Mayers)

Somewhere not too far down on the new administration's list of urgent priorities, is the propaganda challenge. Enough has already been written on this subject by specialists in military affairs, geopolitics, sociology, and related fields to fill a small library. But a few have discussed propaganda from the viewpoint of people in the advertising business. To such, a logical approach might be "an appraisal of the competition."

THE WORLD'S LARGEST ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

It is estimated that the Soviet Union's worldwide propaganda machine directly or indirectly employs about 500,000 persons to sell its bill of goods to the world. This colossal organization operates on a round-the-clock and round-the-calendar basis in every country of the free world, and behind the Iron Curtain as well. A substantial percentage of its personnel is located in communism's promising "markets" of Asia, Africa, and South America.

The international advertising campaign they conduct has little in common with any other advertising undertaking. It is similar, however, in one aspect. Like other huge campaigns, it is very expensive. It requires not only a well disciplined and well positioned personnel, but vast sums of money. The total annual expenditure exceeds $2 billion.

Much of this world's largest appropriation is raised from the overexploitation of enslaved masses, from the Baltic to East Germany. One reason why an East Berliner works harder than a West Berliner but earns less is the fact that part of what might have been his take-home pay goes to the Kremlin and helps pay for Soviet propaganda. More rubles come from profits from a vast network of industrial and commercial import-export companies operated in the free world by Communist auxiliaries. And in those democratic countries where a Communist Party is strong, additional propaganda revenues are raised through the systematic looting of such institutions as labor unions and municipal governments.

THE MARKETING STRATEGY

The most important market maps hanging in the Politburo conference rooms of the Kremlin are those of Asia, Africa and Latin America. If the Communist drive can succeed in those areas, Europe will fall in line, too. Then America would succumb with the civilization of which it is a part. The Communists believe this can happen, and that their timetable is being fulfilled. That's why Mr. Khrushchev was probably sincere when he told Americans, "Your children will live under communism." His prophecy seems a little less preposterous, when one approaches it via Asia, Africa, and South America.

The Communist drive is making progress in those continents, in two directions. One is the actual conversion of people to the Communist ideology, through seductive propaganda that plays on the hopes and passions of the masses. Political activity in the other direction avoids ideological labels, yet gains effective control of key politicians who are rising to power, while protesting they are not Communists.

Cuba is just one example. Castro may fall tomorrow, but Communist political conspiracies never quit. New Red-manipulated leaders will gain mass followings in other parts of Latin America, in southwest Asia, in India, in the Near East, in Africa. This will continue as long as it is the Communists who make the strongest appeal to the minds and hearts of the masses in the developing countries.

HOW WE MEET THE COMPETITION

What about the counterappeal of the West? It is weak. It is inadequate. Even where our counterpropaganda effort seems ample, it is often irrelevant to the immediate self-interest of its target audience. The West's propaganda war with communism is a pretty one-sided affair, with our side the losing side.

This is not directly the fault of those who operate the U.S. Information Agency. On the whole, that Agency's 3,000 employees in the United States and the 1,000 Americans serving it overseas are as capable and dedicated as the staff of any other Government agency. Extensive observations abroad lead me to believe they are considerably more so. Responsibility for our propaganda weaknesses and failures goes deeper. It must be jointly shared by our State Department and Congress. The Information Agency is not invited by the State Department to consult on decisions seriously affecting the U.S. propaganda posture. In State, the USIA is regarded as a mere publicity service, and it can only wring its hands, in an agony familiar to many a pr man, when its "client" adopts foreign policies without full awareness of their propaganda implications.

Congress has been arbitrary in a different way. Many Congressmen do not fully understand the propaganda challenge. They insist on confusing propaganda with "information." They support only the latter, and that grudgingly. Information about the United States is as different from counterpropaganda as a rear-line field kitchen is different from a front-line raid.

NO REAPPRAISAL OF STRATEGY

The U.S. Government has bent every energy to keep up to date in the techniques of shooting wars. We spent billions for bombers, then, reappraising our security needs, we switched to missiles. More billions for missile bases, and then, for more security, we added Polaris-firing submarines. As arms technology has advanced, we have shown no hesitancy in discarding the old for the new, because we are determined always to be in a position to effectively deter any Communist military aggression.

When it comes to deterring enemy propaganda aggressions, our determination evaporates. We continue to operate an information agency whose methods have hardly been changed and whose operations have hardly been enlarged in a decade. Each year, a peacetime appropriation of unpredictable size is made by a Congress that since 1948 has never undertaken a serious reappraisal of either our propaganda policies or our propaganda weaponry. These obviously must be evaluated in some relation to the operations of the enemy. When this is suggested, the idea is usually waved aside with the righteous phrase, "We don't want to fight a propaganda war the way the Kremlin does." True, we don't have to fight in the same way the Soviets fight. But we do have to put up a real fight in our own way.

Just what is our own way? What are our policies? What are our objectives, and how do they relate to the objectives of our adversaries?

THEIR OBJECTIVES AND OURS

There is no mystery about world communism's objectives. Its determination to destroy us and put the entire free world under totalitarian rule was well known long before it was recently reaffirmed during 3 weeks of ideological discussions and cold war strategy planning by Communist leaders from 80 countries. "When did Western statesmen last spend 3 weeks together, thinking out their ideology?" a NATO nation's diplomat queried after the recent Moscow meeting. "Normally their meetings are crammed into 3 days, and most of the time is devoted to considering how to react to something the Communist bloc has already done. This reluctance to come to grips with ideology has been one of the most striking characteristics of the Western nations since the war."

Day-to-day improvising of policy, and reluctance to take the long view have probably ended with the arrival of a new administration in Washington. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is quoted as saying, "If we expect to come on target in the present, we are going to have to aim at the future." Taking such an aim at the future will no doubt require the laying down of very specific long-range objectives for our propaganda warfare.

It won't do simply to define our long-range objectives in such worthy generalities as "defeating communism," or "winning the cold war," or "liberating satellite slave-states." We need step-by-step objectives, and a time table.

Whatever the future targets, the United States must continue to negotiate with ruthless adversaries. We must enter such negotiations always with extended hand and untiring effort to improve relations, even though we know they cannot be persuaded to abandon their dedication to our destruction. We know we face protracted warfare on the propaganda and other cold war

fronts * * * a warfare that will not be ended "in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even, perhaps, in our lifetime on this planet."

OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO

A realistic first-step counterpropaganda objective is the halting of the threatened expansion of Communist control in Free Asia, Africa and Latin America. On those continents there are no less than 90 free nations. No attempt will be made here to suggest how we might attain the first objective of securing all those free nations against further Communist aggression through vigorous, imaginative and adequately financed counterpropaganda undertakings. Our success depends not merely on better made in United States propaganda strategy, but in our extensive employment of thoroughly trained citizens of those 90 nations, who would be fighting the propaganda war in behalf of their own countrymen and the entire free world. There will be no lack of manpower, ideas, methods or money, once the United States develops the will to act.

The above objective might be gained within the next several years. A second, longer range objective is a gradual shifting of the policies of Soviet leadership to a greater concern with the internal welfare of the Russian peoples, and a correspondingly less aggressive concentration on political subversion of free world nations. We must do more than wait and hope for such a possible shift. It could surely be expedited by skillful and persistent propaganda strategy that widens and intensifies the cleavages between what the Russian people want most and what the present rulers in the Kremlin want most. This is a realistic propaganda objective, for the free world even though many Russians in Soviet industrial areas have no strong sense of conflict with the Kremlin, at present.

KREMLIN PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAKNESSES

After observing Moscow's many schools of propaganda a few years ago, William Benton stated that propaganda is Russia's biggest industry. It is a gigantic activity internally as well as externally. To be kept quiescent, the Russian people must continually be reassured of the Soviet's international righteousness, of the Communist destiny to rule the world, of the inevitable decline of the West and of its desperate determination to wipe out the Russians people with atomic bombs. By thus playing alternately on Russian national pride and national fears, the Kremlin has thus far been able to partially conceal its basic conflict with the well-being of the Russian people.

But the Soviets 40-year-old effort to convert Russian humans into biochemical state tools that can be mass manipulated and controlled, hasn't succeeded. They are still human souls with material and spiritual needs. In conflict with their human desire for higher living standards is the Kremlin's policy of diverting a large part of the national industrial potential to armaments. In conflict with their human desire for communication with the West is the Kremlin's rigid controls on travel, on reading matter, and on broadcasts from beyond the Iron Curtain. In conflict with their spiritual yearnings is Communist atheism. In conflict with their desire for peace and friendly relations and their natural instinct to like America, is the Kremlin-induced state of mental war, fear, and hatred.

Despite age-old Russian nationalist aspirations, communism's world-revolutionary objective is not a natural one to the Russian people. The czars were interested in the Dardanelles, but not in Guiana or Cuba. The Kremlin has had Slavs massacred as freely as Baltic peoples or Hungarians. Russia just happens to be the headquarters for a communism that is basically as anti-Russian as it is anti-American. The Kremlin old guard have been revolutionists all their lives, they know little else, and are not particularly good at anything else. They thrive only in an atmosphere of conspiracy and conflict. Who can say that the progress in the arts of peace a great Russian people has made under their rule wouldn't have been even greater, if the Bolshevik had not overthrown the non-Communist government that succeeded czarism?

These are viewpoints that it is within the power of an enlightened and aggressive Western propaganda policy to nurture in Russian public opinion, over the next decade. Once established, they cannot fail to influence eventual Kremlin leaders. Particularly if their predecessors had failed to make any more progress on the Asian, African, and South American continents than in Western Europe.

THE LIBERATION OBJECTIVE

The ultimate Western objective is the total defeat of communism as a world-revolutionary movement, and the liberation of enslaved states. A determined America seeking that objective will still retain its national characteristic of impatience in international matters. Because of our urge to get the job done, there would not be satisfaction in all quarters with a cold war propaganda objective that merely aims at shifting future Kremlin policy to "Russia first." This may appear to be little more than a compromise.

On the contrary, that objective is revolutionary. It leads to a Kremlin leadership sincerely interested in accommodation with the West, after decades of the reverse. A Russian generation in reasonable contact with U.S. capitalism must discover that the Marxian charges of labor exploitation and the Khrushchev charges of colonialism are applicable only to totalitarian communism. That can be the beginning of its end. Such an end is what Western leadership should start predicting tomorrow, as frequently and as confidently as Khrushchev and Mao predict our doom today.

A pro-Russian trend in the Government of Russia can be followed by a pro-Hungarian Government in Hungary and similar developments in all slave states. Not through voluntary or evolutionary processes in Europe, but through the dynamics of a relentlessly prosecuted propaganda war by a Western leadership fully aware of its role as champion of freedom everywhere. That role must be pursued with vigor, not merely because it is a promising long-range propaganda policy, but because it is our national destiny, regardless of expediency. Only in that role do we have an appeal to the minds of men, before which the adversary is bankrupt.

When President Kennedy's state of the Union message expressed the hope that Eastern European nations would be liberated, the Soviet press, ever sensitive to such references, countered with the lame defense that the people themselves elected their present path of development. Little harm was done to Soviet prestige by that single Kennedy mention. But the U.S.S.R. would be hopelessly on the defensive if Western leaders were to repeat that hope for the enslaved peoples week after week, for months and years, coupled with demands for free elections in satellite countries.

There will always be the temptation to forego such forthright adherence to U.S. principles in our propaganda, for the seeming expediency of a softer line. For instance, for the hope that the behavior of Red China may some day force the United States and the U.S.S.R. together as allies. That possibility and a dozen others might justify a nonaggressive counterpropaganda policy, if there were no higher guide to U.S. policy than expediency. Even if an infallible crystal ball predicted a Soviet-China split tomorrow, our Nation should not today shrink from voicing the principles that have given it its birth, it growth, and its greatness. They are principles that must some day liberate even the enslaved Chinese.

PRESENT MISCONCEPTIONS

To make a start toward thus turning the tide in propaganda warfare, our government must take that warfare as seriously as the enemy does. Too many Western leaders have been lulled into belittling such warfare with the phrase, "After all, it's only propaganda." To this a French authority on Soviet word warfare has replied: "This is a most deceptive and dangerous way for us to seek to reassure ourselves, for, with the Soviets, it is just when propaganda is involved that things really become serious. That is why those who trample on public opinion in their own domain have no greater concern than to win it over in the other camp—while the democracies, who respect public opinion, abandon the field to enemy propaganda."

The U.S. Government spends about $120 million annually on what it considers its propaganda activity. This could hardly be called abandoning the field. That phrase seems more justified, however, when one analyzes U.S. Information Agency operations from the standpoint of their relevance to actual propaganda warfare.

The basic guide for U.S. Information Agency activities is Public Law 402, "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the people of the world, and to strengthen cooperative international relations." This congressional directive specifically authorizes "the preparation and dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its peoples and its policy." Operating within that limiting scope, it is not surprising that the U.S. Information Agency efforts, in terms of actual propaganda warfare, are the despair of friends of America throughout the free world.

The American-Asian Educational Exchange, an organization whose members include many Free Asian leaders, last year asked a number of them their opinion of the job the U.S. Information Agency is doing in Asia. A summary report of the results of that survey reads, in part, as follows:

"U.S. propaganda, if it can be called that, is kept on a high level, and concerns itself with either cultural pursuits or an exposition of society in the United States. Much of it is aimed at a small segment of the population. Above all, U.S. propaganda is hampered by what seems to most Asians to be its apologetic and weak tone. Where Communist propaganda is aggressive, U.S. propaganda is passive."

When this report was released, it produced a new wave of home front criticism of the U.S. Information Agency. Typical was an editorial by the New York World-Telegram, which expounded:

The average Asian doesn't give a hoot about hearing that the average American split-level home has two TV sets and two baths. But he does give a hoot about hearing what he has to gain by standing up for freedom instead of yielding to Communist enticement or intimidation. That is what Uncle Sam's information specialists should be telling him—loud, clear and often."

KNOW YOUR MARKET

If the writer of that editorial were himself a specialist in propaganda matters, he would know that even the many millions of Asians who give a hoot about freedom, and

who admire and love America, dislike being preached to by Uncle Sam's information specialists on the need to resist Communist propaganda. If the Voice of America were to broadcast loud, clear and often about the danger of Communist enticements, it would simply lose its listeners. Rightly or wrongly, most free Asians imagine that they know enough about communism already. In any event, they don't want to hear more about it from the United States, which they hardly regard as an objective source of information on the subject.

They do not consciously accept Moscow and Peking as objective sources of information about communism either. But they are less on guard when the Communist enticements come from the lips of local labor leaders, land reformers and other native patriots. Thus does Communist propaganda influence the thinking of citizens of the emerging nations, and not only those on lower economic levels. Millions in Asia, Africa and Latin America believe the promises of a better life under communism, and the prophecies that the future way of life for all developing nations must be the Communist way.

The greatest U.S. counterpropaganda efforts are concentrated in Asia. While Moscow and Peiping propaganda glorifies communism to the Asian masses, the U.S. Information Agency tells them about life in America. Much of such U.S. Information Agency work is ably done. But it doesn't counteract the Communist boasts. Paradoxically, it even tends indirectly to support them. For in a country like India, many will say of the American story, "They are trying to sell us on the superiority of the capitalist, free enterprise system, which may be OK for them, and to unsell us on the Socialist type of society, which may be better for us."

This, of course, is the impression the Communists want the people of India and all other developing nations to get. It especially pleases Moscow and Peiping to have Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans believe that nothing more is at stake than "competitive coexistence" between two systems of society. This implies that each system is sponsored by an equally legitimate government, equally approved by the people living under it. It diverts attention from the fact that no Communist regime ever proved it could remain in power without the most rigid totalitarian controls. The concept that Communist regimes are as legitimate as Western governments is one that their propaganda ceaselessly seeks to establish in men's minds. To this end it employs a calculated strategy of which few of us are sufficiently aware.

LEGITIMATE INFILTRATION OF THE WESTERN PRESS

Hardly a day passes when U.S. newspaper editors and broadcasters do not devote considerable space and time to some aspect of the Soviets' social system, its economic and trade policies, its agriculture, industry, culture, sports, science, spacemanship, or diplomacy. To a degree, these are logical areas of public interest in an adversary that is openly striving to bury us. However, we do not fully appreciate how many of these Moscow pronouncements, reports, and news leaks are manufactured simply in order to bestow on the Government of the U.S.S.R. a continuing aura of legitimacy, thus distracting from the inherent illegitimacy of any government that must maintain itself by the suppression of those it governs.

Because of the constant flood of news about the legitimate activities of the Soviet Government, the U.S. Information Agency is lured into acting as though the real propaganda issue between ourselves and the Soviets is one of industrial growth or spacemanship or cultural development. These are, indeed, issues in the cold war competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. But they are not sound propaganda issues to be raised in our oversea information programs.

WHERE IS THE PROPAGANDA BATTLEFIELD?

That the United States does view economic, cultural, and scientific rivalries as propaganda issues is suggested by the last annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, a five-man body that counsels the President and Congress on information policies. That report defines the Communist challenge as follows:

"It embraces science, space, scholastics, and sports. It includes ideology and practices, economics, and politics, trade and standard of living."

That official statement inadvertently omits reference to the moral challenge, the one and only challenge of communism that is truly global. It is the only challenge that equally affects every free world nation, and that personally concerns every religious or nonreligious human overseas who respects the concepts of human dignity advanced by Moses, Christ, Mohammed, Buddha, and every other moral teacher of history.

If the issues of human freedom and human dignity are so submerged in the thinking of those who make propaganda policy for the West, it is hardly surprising that our adversaries are so successful in pushing these issues into the background, and keeping them there. So confident are they that they have fully established a status of moral legitimacy in the world that Mr. Khrushchev, at the last United Nations assembly, crowed that "1 billion human beings now live in nations that have taken the path to socialism." He was fairly confident that his U.N. hearers, who included not only delegates, but almost 500 representatives of press and broadcasting media throughout the world, would overlook the fact that most of the billion he referred to live under a tyranny that they would overthrow instantly, if given the opportunity.

THE PROPAGANDA BATTLE IN THE U.N.

After having inspired U.N. audience riots whose offensiveness even topped Mr. Khrushchev's shoe pounding of last year, the Communists now come forth with characteristic peace proposals. As these words are being written, press dispatches from Moscow state: "The Soviet Union has called for an easing of cold war issues in the United Nations. Khrushchev has announced that the Soviet has enough H-bombs to wipe any enemy off the face of the earth." Thus, in a single day, Soviet propaganda calls on the United States to end cold war tensions, and continues its own missile rattling.

To round it off, Mr. Khrushchev magnanimously proposes that the Soviet will withdraw its U-2 and RB-47 charges, which already have failed of passage in the United Nations, if the United States, in turn, will abandon references to Communist crimes in Tibet and Hungary. (Even the latter reportedly continue to this day, in the form of ruthless monthly executions of Hungarian freedom fighters, as they arrive at the age of 21.)

It would indeed be a great day if propaganda speeches and innuendoes could be ruled out at the U.N. The likelihood of this happening on the Soviet side can be judged by the above Moscow dispatches. What the Kremlin strategists are now after is a new basis for crying foul and breach of faith the very first time any U.N. delegate makes any but favorable reference to the Communist bloc. On the other hand, it can safely be predicted that there will be but very brief and very slight reductions of the boastful falsehoods, pious accusations and aggressive threats that will issue from Soviet and satellite delegates in the very same breath in which they accuse the West of "creating cold war tensions."

Faced with this unpleasant likelihood at the next U.N. sessions, how might the U.S. policies differ from last year's? Then the deceptive Khrushchev boasts went unchallenged. And, during weeks of discussion of colonialism, only Philippine and Australian delegates put the Soviet record into unmistakable language. The free world nations as a whole have failed both in and out of the U.N. to challenge Communist falsehoods and pretensions with any degree of unity or determination or resourcefulness.

This failure has not been accidental. The latest Soviet appeal to suspend cold war in the U.N. is but the latest of the many ways the Kremlin propaganda strategists have found to inhibit Western leaders from touching on the undemocratic character of Communist regimes, the plight of Hungary and Tibet, or even such continuing items of news as the streams of East European refugees who daily risk the electrified barbed wire and land mines that separate them from freedom.

SILENCE IS ACQUIESCENCE

Commentators and columnists discussing East-West confrontations often justify the West's delicacy in these matters by saying "nothing is to be gained by trading insults." This seemingly highminded excuse has served the Soviets admirably. It suggests that the Soviet's frequent and violent propaganda charges against the United States are somehow less frequent and less violent than they would be, if we methodically chose to call the world's attention to the moral hypocrisy inherent in so many Soviet propaganda postures. According to a Reader's Digest article on the cold war, the U.S. State Department has for years been dominated by the wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds, they are bound to see how well meaning we are, and will stop harassing us.

The opposite practice of never letting the world forget the blunt truth about Red behavior would be insulting only in the sense that Jesus insulted the Pharisees when he referred to them as whited sepulchers. No great religious or moral leader of history ever hesitated to uncover an evil while proclaiming a truth. But some of today's free world leaders have been mesmerized with the notion that to be alert in exposing the Soviet's international frauds is poor strategy because nothing is to be gained by it. On the contrary, everything may be lost if we neglect this duty to the free world. Unless the trend is reversed, more and more of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America will continue to accept the Kremlin line that all capitalism is evil, and that communism is on the side of the angels.

It will be recalled that for 8 months after Hitler took his first steps into the Rhineland, there was relatively little military activity, and the whole period was referred to as the phony war. The West was totally unprepared for the blitzkrieg that followed, despite the clear warnings of "Mein Kampf." Today we have equally clear warnings in repeated Communist manifestoes. Yet much of the Western World still prefers to believe that a propaganda war is a phony war, and that it somehow may be ended without the need of an all-out mobilization and counterpropaganda offensive.

The fact is, we are living in the midst of a propaganda blitzkrieg right now. Hardly a day goes by that does not bring to newspapers all around the world a headline like this one that the Los Angeles Times ran a few weeks ago on its front page in 36-point bold: "Chinese Reds See U.S. as World's Main Enemy." The text started as follows:

"PEIPING (Reuters).—The Chinese Communist Party Saturday declared the United States is the main enemy of the people of the whole world. At the same time, it reaffirmed its belief that a world war can be

avoided." This two-column story continued over to an inside page, all of it about as newsworthy as the opening paragraph. Such stories appear continually in practically all U.S. newspapers, and just as surely they appear in papers throughout free Asia, Africa and Latin America.

ENEMY MANIPULATION OF THE WORLD PRESS

On trips abroad in the past few years, I read English language newspapers in eight different free Asian countries. News items and feature articles about developments and achievements in the U.S.S.R. and Red China were plentiful, and almost uniformly laudatory. News coverage about America was negligible. A considerable percentage of such U.S. news as was found had to do with areas like Little Rock. Many of these unfavorable stories are the result of Red infiltration at the working press level.

In the face of such Communist press influence, the U.S. Information Agency in Asia is helpless. In many instances the Asian owners of the newspapers are equally helpless. They cannot control daily content the way U.S. publishers can.

An earlier paragraph referred to the hundreds of foreign correspondents, representing 2,000 publications and broadcasting stations, who cover the sessions of the United Nations. The New York Times' James Reston says that such correspondents, working at the U.N. and in Washington, are more influential in their countries than all the propaganda efforts of the U.S. Information Agency. The Communists do not neglect them. It is those representatives of the world's news channels, rather than the delegates to the United Nations, who are the Soviet's chief target when they charge that Dag Hammarskjold is the organizer of the killing of Lumumba and that the Congo situation is all due to U.S. colonialist conspiracy, of which Dag Hammarskjold is the architect.

Appalled by such charges, the U.N. Secretary-General sadly commented, "Once an allegation has been repeated a few times, it is an established fact, even if no shred of evidence has been brought out in support of it."

What the Soviets repeated a few times in the U.N., they repeated a few thousand times around the world. How much of the rest of the world even once heard or read Dag Hammarskjold's complaint? He concluded it with these hopeful words: "However, facts are facts, and the true facts are there, for whosoever cares for the truth." In theory, all the world wants the truth. But it is a world being everlastingly muddled and manipulated by well-schooled Kremlin agents running that $2 billion campaign.

It is not essential that the United States or all free world nations combined match the dollar expenditures of the Communist bloc for counterpropaganda purposes. However, the free world must match the efforts of the Communist bloc propagandists in their unity of purpose. The free world's lack of a unified determination and a unified strategy are its greatest handicaps in meeting the Communist propaganda challenge.

FREE WORLD DISUNITY

In the field of propaganda, each nation of the free world believes in going it alone. Each thinks of propaganda and information interchangeably, and considers both of them exclusively national activities. This attitude in free world government gives incalculable advantages to their common enemy. It has developed largely because of the successful Soviet strategy by keeping each Western nation continually on the propaganda defensive. By its constant attacks on every aspect of the United States, British, and French policy, the U.S.S.R. has induced these powers to devote most or all of their information facilities to explaining themselves defensively to the rest of the world, and to each other.

Second only to the necessity for establishing a clearly oriented, imaginative and vigorous propaganda policy for the United States itself, is the necessity for developing a unified strategy in psychopolitical warfare for the entire free world. Individual Western nations must of course continue their individual information activities, interpreting their individual policies to the world, particularly when they are under enemy propaganda attack.

But defensive action alone can never win a propaganda warfare. Success comes only through counteroffensive. There is no reason why a much needed counterpropaganda offensive that will put the Soviets on the defensive should be the function of the United States alone. Since total free world security is involved, there is need for unified strategy, under NATO, SEATO and other international auspices. Such a unified, supranational approach would be logical, even if it were not the only effective strategy for offensive propaganda operations.

The one single example of a supranational counterpropaganda offensive in the free world today is Radio Free Europe. It is successful in its psychological, moral and political offensive against the Soviets. It is an operation that could be multiplied a thousandfold, for an insignificant fraction of what the free world spends on armaments.

CONGRESSIONAL FOOT DRAGGING

Though not brief, this random discussion of the propaganda problem has highlighted only a few of its facets. But enough to indicate that there is a long, tough road ahead. It is a road that cannot be traveled alone by the U.S. Information Agency, even under the direction of such a promising head as Edward R. Murrow. The current Reader's Digest suggests that President Kennedy himself may find in Washington insuperable roadblocks to cold war prosecution, in the form of a defiant, faceless State Department bureaucracy, firmly entrenched.

Commenting on the Murrow appointment, James Reston has indicated that his No. 1 problem may be how to "hold his temper on Capitol Hill." Mr. Murrow will have to reshuffle an overstratified organization, to wrestle with staff mediocrity and staff insecurity, and other internal weaknesses. But Mr. Reston is right in concluding that Murrow's biggest hurdle will be the Congress. Hostility, apathy or sheer ignorance on propaganda matters exists in the minds of too many of our Congressmen. Many of them will assure anyone who asks them that they are aware of our need of better propaganda strategy. They will even agree that something ought to be done soon to correct the appalling imbalance of our efforts. Yet these same Congressmen will give the propaganda problem no priority whatever in their own activities.

A partial explanation of such personal indifference is offered in "Protracted Conflict," a scholarly volume issued by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. "Congressional apathy," says this book, "is due in part to the characteristics of our political system, based as it is upon compromise. Political leaders rotate frequently in office because of party rivalry and shifting public opinion. To stay in office, they must often preoccupy themselves with secondary, parochial problems—to the neglect of crucial issues. It has been almost impossible to interest [U.S.] leaders in the development of a comprehensive [propaganda] strategy designed to frustrate Soviet ambitions."

It would not be impossible to interest any U.S. Congressman, if he started hearing from his constituents that the issue of safeguarding U.S. security, through more effective counterpropaganda efforts, had become a parochial issue. Or more bluntly, an issue affecting his reelection. Any Congressman will gladly give priority to the Soviet propaganda challenge, if he sees tangible evidence that it is a matter of sufficient concern to the folks back home.

A STARTING POINT

Concerned citizens in some congressional districts are already making themselves heard in Washington. When Dan Lewis, a San Francisco agency man, took a page in the New York Times last year to demand more Washington attention to our propaganda failures, Vice President Nixon received 1,500 letters within a week. Dr. Blair Oakley Rogers, a New York physician, has induced others in all parts of the country to stock their waiting rooms with reprints of the Reader's Digest review of "Protracted Conflict," and to otherwise publicize the warnings of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

Preparing to activate letterwriting through mass organizations is the Cold War Council, a Los Angeles PR group which includes the writer, and which is attracting affiliate PR and advertising people in other cities. The special interest of such groups springs from awareness that "the eventual outcome of the struggle will depend to a considerable degree on the extent to which we are able to influence people." That quote is from the 10,000-word report to President Eisenhower by Mansfield D. Sprague and a committee of top level private citizens, after an 11-month study of U.S. propaganda problems. The partly classified report opens with words that might logically close this discussion of the propaganda challenge:

"The 1960's may prove to be one of the most convulsive and revolutionary decades in several centuries."

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on June 8, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture submitted a final report on the feed grain signup. It shows that more than 26,600,000 acres have been signed up to be diverted into soil conserving uses on 1,172,165 farms. The 26.7 million acres to be taken out of corn and grain sorghum production this year is about 26 percent of the U.S. total 1959–60 average plantings of 102.3 million acres for these two crops.

It appears that the feed grain program which the Congress passed, which was recommended by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, has been a success so far as signup is concerned.

In four of the major grain sorghum-producing States, more than 70 percent of the farms have signed up. In Missouri, 85 percent of the farmers have signed up. In Nebraska, 81 percent. In Kansas, 75 percent. In Iowa, 69 percent. In Minnesota, 63 percent. In Illinois, 62 percent. The State of North Dakota was very high on the list. It seems to me like a very good record.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Department of Agriculture, as published on the 8th day of June, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FINAL FEED GRAIN SIGNUP REPORT SHOWS MORE THAN 26.6 MILLION ACRES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1961.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced that the final weekly report on the 1961 feed grain program shows

26,687,682 acres signed to be diverted into soil conserving uses on 1,172,165 farms. The 26.7 million acres to be taken out of corn and grain sorghum production this year is about 26 percent of the U.S. total 1959–60 average plantings of 102.3 million acres for these two crops.

The seventh and final report shows an increase of 2,109,579 acres from the 24,578,103 acres as reported last week. Today's report includes activity through June 1, the final date nationally for putting acreage under the program.

The report shows that farmers have signed up 20,090,511 acres from their 48,870,434 acres of corn base. The 20.1 million corn acres to be put into conserving uses this year is 24 percent of 1959–60 average plantings of 83,648,000 acres. On farms signed up, diversion continued to stay at about 41 percent of the base acreage for these farms. Farmers who planted over 58 percent of the corn acreage during the last 2 years are voluntarily participating in the program.

In six States which accounted for more than half of the Nation's corn acreage and for almost 2.5 billion bushels of production in 1960, over 70 percent of the corn acreage is on participating farms. In Missouri, corn base acreage on farms signed up is slightly less than 85 percent of the State's 1959–60 average plantings; in Nebraska, more than 81 percent; in Kansas, more than 75 percent; in Iowa, slightly less than 69 percent; in Minnesota, more than 63 percent; and in Illinois, slightly less than 62 percent.

Grain sorghum farmers have signed to put 6,597,171 acres in conserving practices. This is over 35 percent of U.S. average sorghum plantings of 18,674,989 acres for grain. Grain sorghum farms signed up represent almost 85 percent of the national plantings with an average diversion of almost 42 percent per farm signed up. In the four major grain sorghum producing States, acreage on farms under the program accounts for 93 percent of the Nebraska average acreage, 86 percent in Kansas, 85 percent in Texas, and 73 percent in Oklahoma.

For all farms signed, possible advance payments under provisions permitting about half of the payments to be made this spring come to about $339,840,000. While the potential total payments under the program are not being determined for the initial reports, Department officials estimate that total payments will probably be more than double the value of the advance payments.

The 1961 feed grain program provides payments to farmers in the form of certificates for placing corn and grain sorghum acreage in conserving uses. Producers may receive grain or the cash equivalent of grain for their certificates. Diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage to soil building practices this year is expected to achieve a better balance between production and utilization of these grains. Payments to producers will maintain their income this year.

The report shows that certificates covering about $265.3 million worth of grain had been issued to farmers under advance payment provisions. Of the $265.3 million worth of certificates issued through June 2, farmers had received about $241 million in cashable sight drafts from county agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) offices. In these instances, as provided under the program, the Commodity Credit Corporation pays farmers in cashable sight drafts and then later acts as their agent in marketing the quantity of grain covered under the certificates.

Through June 2, farmers had used $289,898 worth of certificates to purchase from CCC 281,332 bushels of corn, $1,869 worth to buy 2,803 bushels of barley, $278 worth to buy 497 bushels of oats, and $2,183 worth to buy 1,385 hundredweight of grain sorghum, all from quantities that had been under price-support loan. In addition, farmers had received 185,186 bushels of CCC-owned corn for $195,699 worth of certificates, 7,188 bushels of CCC-owned barley for $5,209 worth of certificates, 526 bushels of CCC-owned oats for $226 worth of certificates, and 8,333 hundredweight of grain sorghum for $14,409 worth of certificates.

More complete information on the signup under the 1961 feed grain program is now being obtained from the field. This will be included in a report to the Congress as required 90 days after the act was signed into law.

The following tables show signup figures by States. The first table shows combined figures for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the number of farms with base acreage, the number of farms signed up, the total acreage to be put in conserving uses, the advance payments that can be paid this spring, the value of certificates issued, and the value of certificates cashed.

The second table shows figures separately for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the average of 1959–60 planted acreages for corn. For grain sorghum, the preliminary total base acreages are shown. This table also shows the base acreages on farms signed up and the acreage diverted on signed farms.

	Number of farms with base acreage	Number of farms signed up	Total acreage to be diverted	Advance payments that can be paid this spring	Value of certificates issued	Value of certificates cashed
Alabama	108,232	29,741	440,024	$2,909,856	$2,803,933	$2,786,469
Arizona	2,109	1,200	57,612	955,957	853,388	802,929
Arkansas	16,590	5,602	90,193	920,153	832,585	810,301
California	5,774	2,828	104,571	1,713,070	1,026,085	922,470
Colorado	14,276	8,083	345,330	2,436,991	1,932,350	1,743,026
Connecticut	206	88	996	16,060	11,670	11,369
Delaware	5,165	1,807	38,522	572,481	536,975	497,514
Florida	15,143	4,610	122,196	1,106,500	1,085,398	1,085,008
Georgia	54,332	14,055	331,722	2,669,062	2,469,941	2,402,138
Idaho	2,567	446	6,465	131,593	95,633	90,202
Illinois	208,466	104,180	2,292,563	39,589,297	25,034,486	22,590,062
Indiana	154,578	66,617	1,382,959	24,227,567	17,081,624	14,443,108
Iowa	192,994	108,447	2,936,504	46,275,587	36,794,182	32,885,366
Kansas	125,200	84,529	2,529,199	23,021,056	12,020,543	11,000,849
Kentucky	92,501	39,629	604,037	7,311,062	7,005,348	6,467,914
Louisiana	19,855	5,330	78,967	861,918	844,019	842,264
Maine	81	43	393	5,055	2,834	2,082
Maryland	18,371	4,161	79,168	1,182,564	1,055,634	940,077
Massachusetts	15	13	159	3,420		
Michigan	93,283	34,359	550,186	7,372,840	6,280,131	5,535,725
Minnesota	125,877	63,832	1,553,739	21,135,971	20,074,153	19,247,364
Mississippi	80,625	18,043	248,592	2,572,220	2,225,371	2,219,928
Missouri	140,440	82,698	2,062,579	31,511,832	29,002,167	27,548,004
Montana	2,821	1,648	39,805	199,575	143,660	135,259
Nebraska	106,291	76,567	2,408,100	29,489,654	19,187,255	15,151,301
Nevada	58	31	852	8,974		
New Hampshire	4					
New Jersey	4,415	1,943	38,798	774,554	553,650	452,960
New Mexico	3,573	2,316	109,712	1,139,655	934,935	871,461
New York	36,404	16,141	190,317	3,054,830	2,816,490	3,017,001
North Carolina	143,794	54,022	543,847	7,684,753	7,593,422	7,538,610
North Dakota	27,219	20,340	414,881	1,793,528	1,631,068	1,431,836
Ohio	149,786	61,206	1,031,624	19,099,785	12,060,158	9,511,265
Oklahoma	43,351	22,854	534,872	3,178,758	2,630,813	2,503,538
Oregon	2,626	1,108	15,542	332,404	280,567	265,198
Pennsylvania	79,608	15,050	168,160	2,938,545	2,856,714	2,832,751
Rhode Island	9	1	30			
South Carolina	57,626	18,142	210,689	2,070,526	1,697,723	1,687,113
South Dakota	61,360	30,287	916,538	6,878,098	6,508,398	6,088,549
Tennessee	91,785	36,199	464,391	5,002,912	4,933,319	4,880,735
Texas	152,878	80,286	2,951,352	24,578,793	21,761,151	19,983,299
Utah	2,316	698	7,699	79,124	47,920	34,987
Vermont	127	81	934	5,145	4,118	1,714
Virginia	43,605	15,352	136,973	1,891,063	1,852,951	1,850,301
Washington	3,207	1,169	20,576	521,042	463,227	450,063
West Virginia	1,551	893	9,520	162,278	109,302	105,623
Wisconsin	119,317	34,959	603,431	10,302,045	8,009,533	7,249,827
Wyoming	1,609	531	12,363	152,372	129,584	125,179
U.S. total	2,612,020	1,172,165	26,687,682	339,840,525	265,273,408	241,042,739

State	Corn			Grain sorghum		Acres to be diverted
	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted	Preliminary base acreage	Base acreage on signed farms	
Alabama	2,212,000	791,317	432,681	34,613	15,478	7,343
Arizona	35,000	4,274	1,666	158,208	134,214	55,946
Arkansas	390,500	122,922	77,955	33,580	27,540	12,238
California	230,000	77,911	34,121	250,794	173,666	70,450
Colorado	493,000	247,080	103,761	708,704	596,491	241,569
Connecticut	41,000	1,674	996			
Delaware	161,500	74,951	38,515		21	7
Florida	600,500	275,903	120,829	4,901	1,972	1,367
Georgia	2,788,500	756,466	322,206	30,968	19,442	9,516
Idaho	81,000	10,250	6,381		167	84
Illinois	10,191,500	6,346,298	2,286,365	24,869	14,296	6,198
Indiana	5,292,500	2,994,489	1,377,940	19,100	11,811	5,019
Iowa	12,481,000	8,592,513	2,921,401	66,359	46,244	15,103
Kansas	2,032,000	1,532,947	654,820	5,473,200	4,720,296	1,874,379
Kentucky	1,779,000	941,615	577,502	27,029	34,099	26,535
Louisiana	527,500	135,550	76,042	7,430	5,972	2,925
Maine	11,000	534	393			
Maryland	506,000	161,031	79,087	910	113	81
Massachusetts	31,500	240	159			
Michigan	2,224,000	984,626	550,151		35	35
Minnesota	6,822,500	4,390,354	1,553,127		1,819	612
Mississippi	1,344,000	442,559	237,217	17,500	24,925	11,375
Missouri	4,270,000	3,610,514	1,833,667	552,273	493,210	228,912
Montana	142,000	83,755	39,805			
Nebraska	6,851,500	5,570,827	1,698,253	1,809,354	1,677,418	709,847
Nevada	4,500	1,003	784		68	68
New Hampshire	11,500					
New Jersey	191,000	68,846	38,798			
New Mexico	47,000	8,581	4,504	326,575	284,894	105,208
New York	656,500	315,632	190,317			
North Carolina	1,978,000	948,403	514,624	85,000	43,827	29,223
North Dakota	1,348,500	1,046,471	414,675	471	462	206
Ohio	3,889,000	1,968,071	1,031,411	1,476	470	213
Oklahoma	270,500	92,674	58,673	1,294,000	949,286	476,199
Oregon	67,500	25,769	15,448		189	94
Pennsylvania	1,286,000	271,440	167,410	9,812	1,151	750
Rhode Island	6,000	49	30			
South Carolina	895,500	397,391	205,066	9,500	10,192	5,623
South Dakota	4,283,500	2,520,625	848,537	222,070	145,281	68,001
Tennessee	1,620,000	716,022	446,241	34,500	30,110	18,150
Texas	1,469,500	783,685	342,610	7,463,564	6,347,800	2,608,742
Utah	51,500	10,926	7,458	339	341	241
Vermont	59,500	1,347	934			
Virginia	806,000	236,957	134,765	7,890	4,267	2,208
Washington	87,000	36,965	18,327		4,695	2,249
West Virginia	148,000	14,924	9,508		14	12
Wisconsin	2,870,500	1,228,308	603,385		108	46
Wyoming	62,000	25,745	11,966		758	397
U.S. total	83,648,000	48,870,434	20,090,511	18,674,989	15,823,142	6,597,171

[1] Planted for all purposes as published in the AMS 1960 annual summary.

ORDER TO ADJOURN TO 12 O'CLOCK MERIDIAN TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to allow all committees to meet until at least 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to meet tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon.

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

REPORT OF GEORGE McGOVERN, DIRECTOR, FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of the food for peace program by Mr. McGovern, relating to the use of our food abundance for refugees and homeless families in 22 different countries of the world, be printed in the RECORD at this point. This is a remarkable program for humanitarian purposes. Mr. McGovern reveals to us the good that is being accomplished.

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

RELEASED FROM THE OFFICE OF GEORGE McGOVERN, DIRECTOR, FOOD FOR PEACE

Refugees and homeless families in 22 different countries of the world are now receiving a helping hand as part of the overall effort of the U.S. food for peace program.

In describing these refugee programs, George McGovern, Special Assistant to the President and the Nation's Food for Peace Director, announced today that the United States has agreed to furnish an additional 720 tons of wheat flour to Algerian refugees in Tunisia.

This brings the total tonnage of U.S. food for peace shipments to Algerian refugees in Tunisia and Morocco to 106,725 tons of wheat, flour, rice, powdered milk and vegetable oil.

This agreement is just one of many government-to-government and voluntary agency food for peace programs which aid homeless people.

Food for peace shipments are also being distributed to refugees and displaced persons in Morocco, Germany, Jordan, Israel, Austria, Italy, Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, Korea, Syria, Egypt (Gaza), Lebanon, Congo, India (Tibetan refugees), Algeria, Greece, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, Vietnam, and France.

PROTECTION OF THE MIGRANT WORKER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this great Nation of ours has long been the showcase of democracy, the ideal which has sustained men struggling for freedom and progress around the globe. To America's shores have come the oppressed of many nations, and over the years they have shared in making these United States great and strong, and in making poverty and suffering strangers to most of its people.

Today, more than ever, the eyes of the world are turning toward America, "the land of the free." We can ill afford to allow poverty a place in our great Nation. The plight of the migratory agricultural laborers in this country has become increasingly evident, both to ourselves and to the nations which would emulate our ways, and many who see our great wealth wonder that we allow deprivation to exist in our midst.

Mr. President, these workers who help tend the abundance of our tables have long been the poorest and most neglected in our Nation. For years individuals, private groups, and State governments have worked to alleviate the hardships of migratory existence, and although progress has been made, it has been scant in view of the total problem.

In my own State of Minnesota we have worked hard to better the lot of the migratory farmworker. But it has become clear that separate efforts by States and individuals will never solve a problem which is basically interstate in

nature. It was therefore with great interest that I noticed an excellent editorial in the New York Times on May 30, which calls for Federal protection of our migratory workers. After telling of recent public testimony concerning the hardships faced by these people, the Times states:

But the moral of that tale has seldom been so clear. Adequate protection from exploitation and the hazards in employment, which is the migrant workers' due, can come only through Federal legislation.

The Times editorial then accurately points out that—

The legislative program relating to migratory farm labor, covered by 11 bills sponsored by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and other Senators, is designed to meet these needs.

Mr. President, I am indeed proud to be associated with this program.

Because the need for a rapid solution to this problem is so vital at this time, and because the New York Times editorial makes so clear the case for Federal efforts to accomplish this end, I ask unanimous consent that the May 30 New York Times editorial, entitled "Protecting the Migrant Worker," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROTECTING THE MIGRANT WORKER

The public testimony given recently by migrant workers about conditions they suffered on farms in New York, New Jersey, and Virginia repeat an oft-told tale: shockingly low wages (with deductions that leave little in cash) and deplorable living quarters. But the moral of that tale has seldom been so clear. Adequate protection from exploitation and the hazards in employment, which is the migrant workers' due, can come only through Federal legislation.

There is urgent need not only to extend the Federal labor laws to farmworkers generally but to make special provisions for the migrants, such as Federal aid for better educational housing, and health facilities. There should also be a Federal recruitment and employment program for domestic migrants along the lines of that which now covers those who come from Puerto Rico. Under it, growers are assisted in recruiting workers through contracts which require the employer to meet minimum standards as to wages and living conditions, with guarantees that migrants will be employed only where there is a shortage of local workers. The legislative program relating to migratory farm labor, covered by 11 bills sponsored by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and other Senators, is designed to meet these needs.

AMENDMENT OF MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 182, Senate bill 870.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 870) to amend the Menominee Termination Act to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after supervision ends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in order to provide economic assistance for a transitional period after April 30, 1961, notwithstanding the publication of the proclamation and the effect thereof as provided in section 10 of the Menominee Indian Termination Act of June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 252), as amended, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans to Menominee Enterprises, Inc., in an aggregate amount that does not exceed $1,500,000 during the four-year period following the date of this Act, for the purpose of financing an expansion or modernization of the corporation's business operations and for the development of tribal resources, under the following conditions:

(1) The Secretary shall be satisfied that adequate funds for the purpose cannot be borrowed on the commercial money market on reasonable terms.

(2) Each loan shall be amortized in not more than twenty years.

(3) Each loan shall be secured by a mortgage or pledge of property satisfactory to the Secretary, and an agreement that the corporation will pay no dividends or make any other payment to the holders of its stock or income bonds as long as any payment on its loan is delinquent.

(4) Each loan shall bear interest at a composite rate consisting of (a) a rate equal to the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the month in which the loan is made, as such rate is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, plus (b) a rate, to cover losses and administrative expenses, determined by the Secretary of the Interior, which rate shall be not less than one-half of 1 per centum and not more than 1 per centum.

(5) Each loan shall be based upon a loan agreement that contains such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any loan made pursuant to this Act may be transferred for administration, collection, and foreclosure of security if necessary to any Federal agency by agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and such agency.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to continue the construction of sanitation facilities on the Menominee Reservation which he believes are reasonable and justified in comparison with comparable rural areas of Wisconsin and to expend for such purpose not to exceed $438,000. The authority granted by this section shall expire at the end of fiscal year 1963.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $1,938,000, as are required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for economic assistance to Menominee Enterprises, Incorporated, and for other purposes."

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Idaho is aware of the situation which makes it necessary for me to leave the Chamber. I wonder if he will yield to me so that I may make two or three remarks on this bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. This has been a long and wearing controversy relating to the Menominee Termination Act. The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the full committee, have spent a great deal of time in trying to solve the problems involved. The solution which has been arrived at is not one which will make everyone happy, but speaking for those on this side of the aisle, the minority membership, they are wholly and heartily in accord with the action which has been taken and with the position the Senator from Idaho will take on the floor.

I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me for the purpose of making these remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. While the Senator from Colorado is in the Chamber, I should like to say for those of us on the majority side that we appreciate very much the fine work the Senator from Colorado did in helping to bring to the floor what I think is a decent proposal. We faced a hard problem, and the junior Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Colorado did excellent work. I commend them both, and say to the able Senator from Colorado that the sort of work he did on the bill evidences the fact that people who are desirious of reaching a final result can get a good result. I congratulate him on the contributions he made.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is overly kind, but I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from New Mexico, in what he has said concerning the services of the Senator from Colorado, which have been most helpful.

I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5 in the committee amendment, line 18, to amend the first sentence of section 3 to reads as follows:

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is authorized to construct under Public Law 86-121 sanitation facilities on the Menominee Reservation which he believes are reasonable and justified in comparison with comparable rural areas of Wisconsin and to expend for such purpose not to exceed $438,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment. We discussed the language of section 3 with officials of the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare, and it was suggested that by revising the present language of the section we would simplify administrative procedure within the Department, and, further, by referring to the statutory authority by which the Department constructs sanitation facilities, we would aid in the transfer of facilities to the Menominee Corporation.

The language would not change the intent of the bill, but is merely in the nature of a clarification.

I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, who tells me he has no objection. I know of no reason why there should be objection to it. I therefore ask that the amendment be adopted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. For the purpose of the record, would the amendment increase in any way the amount of money carried by the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. It would not.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would merely put the bill in shape so that the Surgeon General can handle the facilities in accordance with existing law?

Mr. CHURCH. It was thought by the Department that this language would better facilitate the intent of the committee than the original language adopted by the committee. It would make no change whatever in the substantive provisions of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in 1954 the Congress enacted Public Law 399, providing for the termination of Federal supervision and control over the Menominee Tribe of Indians in the State of Wisconsin. In the intervening years the Congress has approved a series of amendments to the basic act, all of which were designed to facilitate the termination process and to aid the Indians in their transition from trust to nontrust status. The most recent amendment is contained in Public Law 86–733, enacted in 1960, which delayed again the final date for termination until April 30 of this year. There is a long history connected with the termination, but I shall not attempt to recite it all at this point. Suffice to say that the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and the Senate have spent a great deal of time on and have given careful attention to this termination program. Days of hearings were held, and a series of printed hearings reflect, I believe, the concern of the Congress for the successful outcome of the Menominee program.

Early in this Congress there were two bills introduced to amend the 1954 act, S. 869 and S. 870. The first of these bills provided authority to the Secretary of the Interior to delay final termination of the Menominee Indians to a date that he determined was reasonable, if in his judgment more time were needed to complete the program. The second bill, S. 870, would amend the Menominee Act to provide necessary assistance to the tribe to enable it to make an orderly transition after supervision ends. It proposed to extend the final termination date to April 30, 1969, and to establish a $2½ million loan fund to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the Menominees. S. 870 would also provide establishment of a federally chartered corporation on the reservation.

In the report submitted to accompany H.R. 11813, the bill which became Public Law 86–733, the committee took the position that there should be no further extensions of the termination date in connection with this tribe and that termination should proceed as promptly as possible. The record, I think, was clear that further delay would prove injurious to the economic position of the tribe and that it was highly desirable that Menominee Enterprises, Inc., the entity succeeding the tribal organization, be formed and commence operations.

On April 18, 19, and 24, 1961, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which I am chairman, conducted hearings on the bills, S. 869 and S. 870. Witnesses from the tribe, the executive branch, and others testified in connection with these two proposals, and the transcript has been printed and widely distributed. Based on information provided by witnesses, the committee has reported, in amended form, S. 870, the pending bill. The termination date, April 30, 1961, having come and gone, the Federal Government is no longer providing special services to the Menominees because of their Indian status. They are at this moment citizens of the State of Wisconsin and have had transferred to them their property and funds formerly held by the United States. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., has been established, as well as Menominee County, the former reservation area.

Two problems that face the Menominee Indians in this termination procedure were brought to the attention of the committee. The first is that their economic situation is not adequate, and, therefore, there is some danger of failure of their business operations in the future. Their economy is dependent upon the tribal sawmill, which is not a particularly efficient mill and is in need of modernization in order to make it competitive with other mills in that area. The tribal woodlands and lakes offer great potential in terms of development for recreational purposes, but the tribe lacks adequate funds to develop this asset properly.

The second problem relates to sanitation facilities on the reservation. Recently the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made a survey of the area and on the basis of that survey began the construction of sanitation facilities—water mains and sewer lines. In testimony before the committee it was stated that the reservation's sanitation system is below the level of comparative communities in Wisconsin and that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have, in the absence of termination, continued construction of these facilities. Again, the tribe does not have the funds with which to do this job.

The committee is very anxious that the Menominee termination program be a successful one. After all, this was a pilot operation, and future terminal programs will depend largely on the success, or lack of success, we have here. For that reason it has been recommended that Menominee Enterprises, Inc., be permitted to borrow funds from the Federal Government for the purpose of modernizing and expanding the existing sawmill facilities and to develop recreational resources to which I referred. The committee has also recommended, in view of the fact that construction of the sanitation facilities had commenced prior to termination, that it be completed and the sum of $438,000 be authorized for that purpose.

A total of $1,938,000 is authorized to be appropriated by this proposed legislation—$1.5 million for loans to Menominee Enterprises, Inc., and the remainder for the completion of the sanitation project.

Although S. 870 as introduced did not authorize any special Federal financial assistance to the State of Wisconsin or to Menominee County, testimony was received from State and Indian witnesses to the effect that the new county, under its authorized tax levy, could not furnish necessary services to its population. A request was made for Federal funds to be made available to the State and/or the county over a period of 5 years for education, health, and welfare purposes. The committee was informed that the new county created by the State will have a population of about 3,200. It includes the forest holdings of the corporation and has a tax base of approximately $17 million. Wisconsin ordinarily limits the amounts that counties may levy for local support to 1 percent of the assessed valuation of their real property. In the case of Menominee County, this rule has been modified to permit county levies of 1½ percent and town levies of one-half of 1 percent. At these rates, the total possible collection will be about $340,000, an amount less than the estimated cost of operating the local governments.

In the several termination programs that have already been completed, Congress has not authorized the expenditure of Federal funds for Indians following a termination date. When termination occurs, Indians are in exactly the same status as any other citizen within a State. To begin at this point subsidizing a State for services that it normally furnishes to its citizens would be, in the opinion of the committee, an undesirable precedent. Moreover, the State of Wisconsin has an equalization statute that provides financial assistance to deficit counties. The committee was not given data that would

provide the basis for an informed judgment about the adequacy or inadequacy of the State equalization procedure. Therefore, no provision has been made in the bill for funds to aid in the transition from Indian status to non-Indian status.

It was stated to the committee that the management of the new Menominee corporation intends to increase substantially the sustained yield timber cut, increase employment in the mill, and take other measures to strengthen the local economy. With the additional benefits provided through this proposed legislation, it is believed that every reasonable assistance has been afforded the Indians to make a successful transition to unrestricted status.

According to information obtained from the Department of the Interior, the Menominee Indians had a cash balance on April 30, 1961, of approximately $1.3 million. They have real property appraised at $35 million, and a lumberyard, byproducts, and log inventory valued at $1.9 million. In intervening years since the original termination legislation was enacted, the Federal Government, moreover, has expended approximately $4 million in preparing the Indians for nontrust status.

So taking into account all these subjects, it is the judgment of the committee that the pending bill, as amended, represents the fairest settlement we could make without setting a dangerous precedent that would plague us in connection with subsequent terminations of other Indian tribes.

I believe the bill is equitable. I believe that the credit which the bill provides gives every promise of resolving any potential economic difficulty facing the tribe, and that the grant contained in the bill for the completion of the necessary sanitary facilities will also enable the tribe finally to solve a very difficult problem that has long confronted them.

On the whole, the bill seems to me to represent the best settlement that the committee could arrive at, and I commend it to the Senate for its approval.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is never a welcome task to oppose the recommendations of a committee. I know full well how much time has been given to matters affecting the Menominee Indian Tribe's termination. The distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the able chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], as well as the members of the subcommittee, have spent many hours hearing testimony of witnesses and considering the proposals in executive session.

I know of no bill, excepting a bill of great national importance, that has received the kind of careful, thoughtful, day-after-day, hour-after-hour attention that the present bill has received in committee. It is a great tribute to the conscientious and responsible attitude of the members of the committee that they have given so much time and effort to the bill. I was deeply impressed by such consideration, and I know that the officials of the State of Wisconsin who appeared before the committee were impressed also.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I merely wish to add for the RECORD the fact that from the beginning the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been an indefatigable champion of the Menominee Indians. At every opportunity he has spoken up for them. I know he is in disagreement with the judgment reached by the committee, and he proposes to amend the pending bill. But I merely wish to state for the RECORD that he has always been on hand to speak out for the Menominee Indians at every committee meeting at which legislation affecting them was being considered by the committee, for which he should be strongly commended.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Idaho. His statement makes it ever more difficult for me to say what I must say.

Unfortunately, the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee are unsatisfactory. The bill does not provide enough financial assistance to enable the Menominee community to make a successful transition to self-government.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico if he still wishes me to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that the Senator from Wisconsin was extremely unsatisfied, and he is not yet satisfied. I recognize that to satisfy him would be an impossible task for us. However, I wish to add my words to the words of the chairman of the subcommittee and to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that if we must have disagreement, I am glad that we had such disagreements we had them with him—constantly, frequently, and out in the open. He presented his views strongly, as did the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who came to me and had words to speak on behalf of the Menominees.

I appreciate the consideration of the Senators from Wisconsin, and I wish to say in tribute to them that I believe this is the first time in the termination of a tribe that anything like this amount of money provided has been made available to the tribe for additional expenses based upon termination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall try to demonstrate how both the junior and the senior Senators from Wisconsin can be very well satisfied this afternoon. Not much would be required to satisfy us. We ask that the House bill be passed.

I had hoped that it would be possible to postpone the transfer of title to the tribal property until the Secretary of Interior clearly saw that the tribe was managing its own affairs successfully. This was the alternative program suggested in the report of the Department of the Interior. Now that termination has taken place, as of April 30, 1961, my amendments, S. 869 and S. 870, as well as the proposal of the Interior Department, are no longer relevant.

But the change in the tribe's legal position has not altered their physical and economic difficulties. It is well known that the Menominee people were apprehensive as they contemplated their termination, and that the main reason for their anxiety was financial. The members of the Menominee community know that they will continue to require essential health, welfare, education, community and governmental services, and that the fact of termination per se will not alter the costs or enhance their ability to meet them.

The Federal Government has made a substantial contribution toward these services for some time. Failure to phase out these payments over a period of years will present the Menominee community with a serious, abrupt financial shock, which it would have an extremely difficult time meeting.

Estimates of the health, welfare, and education costs now borne by the Federal Government have been furnished by Mr. George Kenote, the tribal coordinator for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They are as follows:

Health and sanitation	$98,300
Public welfare	228,827
Education	282,991

These figures total a little more than $600,000. No county costs or administrative costs are included. The Senate bill provides nothing for those purposes.

The health and sanitation category includes the following items, among others: Tuberculosis hospitalization, public health nurse, sanitarium aid, garbage and refuse collection, vital statistics and clerical work. Public welfare includes a number of costs, among them administration, indigent medical care services, general assistance, relief, public assistance, mental institutions, child welfare, and State hospitalization. The education aids include funds now provided under Public Law 874 and under the Johnson-O'Malley program. In addition it is expected that many children will drop out of the parochial school and come to the public school if a good school is built. The tribe has made a substantial contribution to the parochial school for children's education. Since the tribe as such no longer exists, it will be hard to maintain such a contribution, and the attraction of the good new school in Shawano is understandable.

The bill adopted by the House of Representatives on May 9 provides for a phased out program of grants to the State of Wisconsin, to lessen the financial burden of termination. For the coming year, the House bill authorizes a maximum of $540,000, as a contribution to these essential health, education, and welfare services. In future years, that maximum would be reduced by 20 percent a year, until 1967 when the grants would cease entirely.

This is a modest proposal, fully justified by the costs and circumstances of termination. Unfortunately, the Senate bill as reported by the committee omits any such grants for services. It is for this reason that I urge the Senate to accept the language of the House bill in its stead.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] supported the recommendation in the report, which stated that the Menominee Indians are now like any other citizens of Wisconsin. While such statement perhaps has some appeal, the fact is that the Indians are unlike other citizens of Wisconsin. The fact is that the Menominee Indians have now, for the first time, completed their reservation status, and it is extremely hard to adjust from a life that has for many generations—for literally thousands of years—been one in a relatively primitive society. To expect them to adjust to mid-20th century America very quickly, it seems to me, is neither realistic nor humane. I realize that the Federal Government has already made provisions for payments. We are merely asking that those payments be phased out in an orderly, even way.

I believe one of the great shames of America, which we all recognize in our humane moments, has been the mistreatment of the red men by the white men.

I believe that this record of mistreatment is one which can be corrected, and on a relatively modest basis. This is a new kind of situation. There are few precedents for it, but I believe that that is all the more reason why the Federal Government can afford to be generous. These Indians at one time occupied a quarter of the State of Wisconsin, their land covering hundreds of square miles. They have now been reduced to a tiny reservation, given to them in perpetuity. It seems to me that the least we can do is be a little generous with them.

The two bills are less at variance in their other financial provisions. The House version authorizes a $2.5 million loan for the economic development of the tribal enterprises, while the Senate bill provides $1.5 million. The larger amount in the House bill is essential in view of the importance of adequate capital for the Menominee's principal enterprise, the lumber mill. Anyone who has had experience with small business knows the great difficulty in obtaining adequate capital so that it can be invested in up-to-date, modern equipment and machinery. We have had that kind of experience in Congress. We have had examples of people coming to the Congress and asking for a certain sum, only to find that they cannot adequately do the job with that amount of money.

Mr. President, we should provide $2½ million. The Appropriations Committee can make certain that the appropriations are made on an equitable, fair, and reasonable basis.

Both bills also provide $438,000 to complete construction of essential sanitation facilities in the Menominee community. About this needed improvement, which is already under way, there appears to be no disagreement.

I think all of us recognize by now that "termination" as such and by itself is not a magic solution to all the problems, economic and otherwise, which are the lot of so many American Indians. The Menominees of Wisconsin are no exception. The tribe became a self-governing county in Wisconsin on April 30. They appear to have weathered the initial stages of this transition. But their concern about where the money will come from to pay for the many essential services that we all take for granted in our communities remains a major source of anxiety.

It may be asked, "Why can't the tribe pay for all its own services, in view of the fact that it owns valuable timber land?" Under the termination plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the tribe incorporated its sawmill operation as Menominee Enterprises. It was hoped that by increasing the annual cut of timber to 29 million board feet, it would be possible to provide sufficient revenues to meet the costs of their services.

This has not turned out to be the case. In the first place, when the experts from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the University of Wisconsin took a look at the condition of the tribe, they realized that the expenses of providing adequate service would be higher than previously anticipated.

In the second place, the hopes for increased revenues from increased cuts of timber have been dealt a serious setback. My colleagues from timber producing States know that the market for lumber is in a very depressed condition at present. Sales of lumber in Wisconsin now barely cover the costs of production. The Menominee Enterprises face a situation which is no exception to this rule.

Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that the technology of their sawmill and timber handling operations is seriously obsolete. To be competitive in the modern timber industry, their old sawmill must be greatly mechanized, with the addition of much automatic equipment. Processes which permit more complete utilization of each log must be adopted.

The engineering survey conducted for the tribe by the Mater Engineering firm of Corvallis, Oreg., states that large dry kilns for drying the lumber must be substituted for the present method of air drying.

It is for such modernization that the loan would be authorized. But improvements as extensive as these take time. A new president for the enterprises has recently taken up his duties. It will be a matter of some years before the sawmill and other revenue-producing projects can be expected to function with full efficiency.

During this transition period, the phased-out program of grants for essential services must be provided. I have received a letter from Mr. Frederic Sammon, an outstanding lawyer in Milwaukee who is the tribal attorney, which states:

> We will badly need the transitional aids voted by the House for the services, for the new sewer system, and for the corporate loan.

Mr. President, this is the issue before the Senate: Shall the House bill be accepted, or shall amendments be accepted which would deprive the tribe of the additional funds which they need, so that these health, education and welfare services may be provided?

Mr. Sammon continues:

> Otherwise, the corporation will have to pick up the bill, through excess taxes, and, unless it makes more money than we even have hoped for, the funds will have to cut into the interest payments on the income bonds of the tribal members. That is a legal solution but not a satisfactory one or perhaps a fair one.

These aids are not by any stretch of the imagination intended to be a permanent subsidy in the Menominee community. The House bill provides a carefully worked out program, under which the Federal contribution would be reduced each year, and come to a definite end in 1967.

The need for this interim assistance was clearly demonstrated and fully documented in testimony and statements presented at hearings before both the House and Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittees by the tribe, their representatives, spokesmen for the Government departments, and representatives of the State of Wisconsin.

My colleagues in the House, the senior Senator from Wisconsin and I, the Governor of Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin are united on this position.

At no time was any testimony presented which would indicate that the tribe could terminate successfully without some financial assistance for services such as is provided in the House bill.

Since the figures I have cited above represent the actual costs of services, they are somewhat higher than those provided for the first year in the House bill. After detailed discussions with representatives of the departments, and with the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable John Reynolds, the House committee concluded that the sums authorized in their bill would be sufficient. It is hoped that the Menominee community will be able to sustain the extra costs themselves.

I recognize, of course, that these estimates can be no more than reasonable predictions of the costs providing the services to the tribe, beyond what they can pay for themselves. Every Senator knows that the detailed justifications which would be required by the Appropriations Committees would provide further assurance that every dollar spent is fully justified in the light of the needs and revenues of the fledgling community.

It should be made clear that these Federal payments would be made to the State of Wisconsin, which has now taken over the responsibility of assuring that adequate services are provided to the Menominees. These payments would not be made to Indians as Indians. Rather they would reimburse the State of Wisconsin for costs which the State will incur if an adequate level of services is maintained. It seems to me quite irresponsible to suggest that the costs, previously borne by the Federal Government, should simply be charged to the State in which this reservation happened to be situated. The Wisconsin taxpayer should not have to shoulder such a financial responsibility, especially since the terms of the transfer were worked out and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Menominee Tribe has now set out upon an experiment of self-financed self-government which is unique in our experience. I hope it will be possible to give

them the financial aids needed to make this experiment an unqualified success.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal for April 30, 1961, describing the many problems facing the Menominees in their termination, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

COUNTY IS A CHALLENGE TO MENOMINEE INDIANS: FEDERAL CONTROL OVER THEIR 234,000 ACRE RESERVATION CEASES AT MIDNIGHT

(By Richard C. Kienitz)

KESHENA, WIS.—The Menominee Indian Reservation, one of the most beautiful forest tracts in Wisconsin, becomes the State's 72d county at midnight Sunday.

The Menominees have survived fires, tornados, and land-grabbing schemes since they accepted the 234,000-acre reservation from the United States in an 1854 treaty.

But the end of Federal Government supervision promises to be the most critical challenge. It comes at a time that the timber industry, upon which 75 percent of the Menominees depend for a living, is at a low ebb.

Their forest, which produces nearly 8 percent of the State's annual harvest of sawtimber, and their sawmill, stores, and homes, are valued at nearly $40 million.

ORDER SHOCKED THEM

Talking about the transition to a county, Bernard Grignon, the tribal treasurer and chairman of the provisional county board, said flatly, "We're not afraid of it." Yet, it is not hard to find others who will say, "We are not ready yet."

As reservation Indians, the Menominees chafed under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs, which held a tight rein on the tribal purse strings and veto power over the tribal council. But it was a great shock when Congress in 1954 ordered termination of the supervision by the end of 1958. The tribe claimed it was forced on them and won two delays—to December 31, 1960, and then to midnight Sunday.

LOANS ARE SOUGHT

The birth of the 72d county will be marked by services Sunday at St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Neopit. Eleven other Indian tribes in Wisconsin have been invited to take part in a dance ceremony in Keshena. A representative of the Federal Government was expected to be there to transfer the deed to the reservation to Menominee Enterprises, Inc., a corporation which manages the lumber industry.

TRIBE SUED UNITED STATES

To help the reservation ease into its new role as a county, congressional leaders are trying now to push through loans for the Menominees, and outright grants for health, education, and welfare programs.

Events leading up to the new county date back to a tornado in 1905 that destroyed 35 million board feet of timber. Accusing the Government of negligence in the salvage job and several later instances, the tribe sued the United States.

When tribal members, finally won an $8,500,000 settlement in 1951, they asked to divide up some of it among the 3,270 enrolled members of the tribe. The House of Representatives agreed to pay out $1,500 shares to each member of the tribe, but some Senators thought it was a good time to start getting the Government "out of the Indian business" and a termination bill was brought up.

According to the tribe, Senator WATKINS, (Republican of Utah) gave them the choice of accepting termination or not getting the $1,500. The Menominees agreed—with later regrets.

NO PATH TO FOLLOW

The first worry was that timber interests would soon lay their hands on the 220,000 acres of forest, rich in hardwoods and pines that tower nearly 100 feet. Representatives LAIRD (Republican of Marshfield) and REUSS (Democrat of Milwaukee) obtained amendments to assure continuance of the sustained yield management plan initiated in 1908. (So well managed is the forest that although more than a billion board feet of timber has been harvested, there is more standing now than when the operation began.)

Termination was admittedly an experiment. There was no pattern to follow, so the Menominees were left the task of working one out.

Tribal leaders, State agencies, attorneys, and University of Wisconsin experts worked countless hours and compiled reams of reports in exploring many alternatives. These included making the reservation a State forest, a national park, a separate county, part of adjoining Shawano and Oconto Counties, or dividing it between the two.

The tribe chose to establish Menominee County—64th in size in the State and one of the least populated. The State legislature approved, but because of misgivings made its decision subject to review within 8 years. Some wondered whether such a county, with a single industry and few people trained in business and government, could succeed.

The Menominees long have owned their own power utility, telephone company, hospital, home for the aged, and roads, but most were built without having to conform to State codes and, therefore, are substandard in many ways. These present only a few of the problems.

COME UP WITH PLAN

In the face of the challenge, Menominee leaders felt they could succeed. Their attorneys came up with this plan:

Menominee Enterprises, Inc., will take over tribal assets, with enrolled members as stock and bond holders.

A trusteeship will assume guardianship of the affairs of minors.

Menominee County will have just one town and a joint town-county board of seven members. For school purposes it will be part of the neighboring Shawano district.

It will join Shawano County under a single judge, district attorney, and superintendent of schools.

SHARE WELFARE COSTS

The Shawano County Director of Public Welfare will handle Menominee County welfare matters on a cost sharing basis, as it has been handling its Federal social security benefits.

Beginning officers will be appointed by the Governor, largely based on Menominee recommendations.

Embarking on a new county experiment does not mean that the Menominees will step into an entirely new way of life. They have been U.S. citizens since 1924, subject to most State laws since 1954 and eligible for military draft. They already can hold public office, sit on juries and vote in local, State and national elections.

NOT ALL INDIANS

The new county will not be exclusively Menominee. Only some 2,700 of the enrolled members live in it. Another 600 residents include white people who married into Menominee families or who work for the tribe, and nonmember Indians. Some 1,400 persons live in the sawmill community of Neopit and 1,000 in the Government center, Keshena.

Some tribal leaders believe that the Menominees could lose political predominance in three generations. Only 3 percent now are pure bloods.

"We anticipate the day," said one Menominee, "when people will no more ask us if we are Menominees than they ask your nationality in Milwaukee now."

Far and away the greatest problem facing the tribe is the economic one. Its forest industry must make a profit because in the beginning it virtually will be the only taxpayer—owning all but 21 acres deeded to a Catholic church-school in Keshena.

Some 500 families have built home on land to which they claim squatter's rights, but it will be some time before clear titles are worked out. Leases will be available to outsiders, but details for these still must be arranged.

NEW INDUSTRY DISCUSSED

The business, which is expected to produce more than $400,000 in property taxes, is now operating in the red. Twenty million board feet of lumber are piled in the Neopit millyard where there should be only 14 million feet at this time of year.

The forest and sawmill operations that normally provide a million-dollar-a-year payroll to as many as 400 employees had only 180 working early this month, at an average wage of $53 for a 40-hour week.

Aware of the insecurity of depending on a single industry, tribal leaders believe that another $15 to $20 million must be added to the tax base (figured at $16 million) through new enterprises. Veneer and prefabricated home plants have been discussed. Promotion of a resort industry could help greatly, but the idea is hard to sell to many Menominees, who cherish the privacy of their woodland paradise.

FEDERAL LOAN SOUGHT

Meanwhile, a Federal loan is being sought for industrial development. A Senate interior subcommittee Friday approved one of $1,500,000, plus a grant of $438,000 for sanitation facilities. The House Interior Committee earlier approved a 6-year aid plan for health, education, and welfare programs, beginning with $540,000 the first year and $54,000 in the sixth.

By midsummer, the Federal Government will have brought reservation roads up to State standards.

The tribe still is seeking some organization to operate its 36-bed hospital, now closed because of financial troubles, except for a small outpatient clinic.

FOUND IN 1634

Setting up government offices will be a gradual process, starting with such basic decisions as what records must be kept, and how. The State legislative council has hired Randolph Runden, who long was Racine County board chairman, as its liaison man to give advice in these matters.

The Menominees have been good neighbors to the white man ever since French explorer Jean Nicolet in 1634 found them living along the Menominee River, which now forms the Wisconsin-Michigan border.

RELINQUISHED DOMAIN

They were forced to give up their vast domain—often at a few cents an acre—as they were overrun by white civilization. The last of it was relinquished in an 1848 treaty in exchange for a reservation in Minnesota, later rejected in favor of the present site.

The forested reservation provided a great opportunity. The tribe became the wealthiest in the State, while preserving a rich Indian heritage.

Gradually the Indian Bureau turned over to it all local government functions. It became the most adjusted in the Nation to the white man's way of life. And that, Congress pointed out, was why it chose the Menominees for the termination experiment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Wisconsin. In reply to the statement which has been made, I would like to say that there is no difference between us. We feel that when we are dealing with people who are wards of the State real consideration must be given to their situation. The House went into this question. The House arrived at the conclusions shown in the bill which is on the desk. As stated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, the Governor, and others, including the heads of the University of Wisconsin, all men of judgment, men who know the situation, who are not guessing, are all of the same opinion.

I shall not repeat what has been said by my colleague. I wish to give a little history, so Senators may understand what we are talking about.

On May 9 the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4130, which is on the Senate Calendar. In April 1961, Federal control over the Menominee Tribe was terminated. At the time of the termination, it was my judgment, and also the judgment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, that, because of the serious economic problems confronting the tribe, it would be a great deal better and in the best interest of the Indians and the people of Wisconsin and the country to extend Federal control.

Then we could resolve the inherent problems thereafter. But it did not happen in that way.

When the House reached the conclusion that there should be a loan of $2,500,000 instead of $1,500,000, as the Senate bill provides, they arrived at that conclusion from the evidence and the facts.

It must be clear, as stated by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, that unless we accept the House bill we will have a conference problem on our hands. I may be mistaken, but 22 years of service in the Senate have told me that when there is a matter relating to a State, and the two Senators agree, generally there is no difference and no objection. The attitude of the Senators, especially when backed up by the attitude of the House, should be sufficient for acceptance of the House bill.

I realize that the committee has held some hearings; but, I repeat, I have appeared before committees at times when there was a question of opposition. Still, when the two Senators from the State agreed, the opposition was rubbed out. So in this particular instance, I cannot see why similar logic should not prevail.

Even by the adoption of the more liberal House bill, which I believe should be done, the Menominees would be hard put to meet their obligations. According to the termination plans, the tribe has faithfully attempted to provide machinery to handle its own affairs and to integrate properly into the social, political, and economic system of Wisconsin and the Nation.

Mr. President, I therefore ask that the House bill be accepted; then, upon its signature by the President, it will become law. If there is insistence on the other bill with the amendment, conferees will have to be appointed. I doubt that it will be possible to have the House accept the modified Senate bill, because the Menominees have Representatives in Congress who come from their own country and know the facts.

I trust that the Senate will accept its responsibility and will see to it that adequate compensation, if we wish to call it that, is paid, or that assistance is given to those who are our wards and who, after all, are entitled to the earnest consideration of each and every one of us.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, before the Senate comes to a vote on the bill, I may say that I have listened with attentiveness to the excellent statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and to the detailed exposition of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

I should like very much to be able to concur in the position that the Senate ought to accept the House bill. However, the Senate committee has dealt with the Menominee problem over a long period of time. Several times we have extended the time for termination, each time with the admonition that no further extension would be granted. Yet upon the presentation of the case and the renewed plea of the Menominee Indians, the extensions have been granted.

So I think the committee is familiar with the problem and has tried to be liberal and generous in view of the circumstances. Certainly I would want to do no injustice to the Menominee Indians. Therefore, we have taken great care and have given extended deliberation to this problem.

It has seemed to the committee that Congress has not been ungenerous, so far as the Menominee Indians are concerned. Over the years, a very large settlement of Federal funds has been directed to them. In 1950, if I recall correctly, the Menominee Indians won a judgment in the amount of $8,500,000, which was awarded them. It was following the award of that judgment that the Indian tribe itself, acting through the tribal council, asked for termination. In the process of termination, and during the extensions, from time to time, of the termination date, the Federal Government has expended the sum of approximately $4 million in carrying the termination program.

The bill now before the Senate would make available to the Menominee Indians an additional $1,500,000 in credit for modernization of their sawmill and for the diversification of this industry, and also for the development of their fine recreational potential, plus an additional sum of $438,000 for the completion of sanitation facilities.

All in all, when those figures are added together, they represent a very large sum of money for a tribe of 3,270 Indians, 800 of whom do not live on the reservation.

In view of the developments which have occurred heretofore and the money which has in fact been awarded to the Indians through judgment or appropriated to the use of the Indians by Congress, Congress has tried very hard to be fair. I think the bill represents the best final settlement we could concur upon in the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As to the initial amount which the Senator spoke about as being paid by the Federal Government to the Menominee Indians, is it not true that they were simply stumpage payments paid according to a decision of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior that this sum was due the Menominees?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the committee, who was a Member of Congress at the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. After they got $8.5 million, they sought to increase the payments by a couple of million on the ground that the stumpage payments were not large enough, and the Menominees claimed that their forest had been badly handled. God was the one who did it; he did not let the rain fall at the right time.

But the U.S. Government was trustee, and therefore there was some claim that the trustee had not done all the things it might have done.

I assume the court reached a just verdict. I assume the Menominees were entitled to $8,500,000. Congress paid it. It went into the funds of the tribe. But that had nothing to do with stumpage payments at all. That question arose several years later as a result of an opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It had nothing to do with termination, that is the argument I am making. It was a payment legally and properly determined.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; I do not question that. The $8,500,000 was paid as a part of the claim that the trustee had not properly handled the forest. The United States did not agree with that contention, but the court did, and that settled the matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, there is a sincere difference of opinion on the part of the committee and the representatives from Wisconsin—not simply this Senator or the senior Senator, but the other elected officials—that this is generous, and as generous as it should be under the circumstances.

I also wish to make it clear in the record that the Menominees have indicated over and over again, in every way they knew how, that their termination—their decision for termination back in 1953—was a decision which was made in their judgment through a misunderstanding of what the situation would be. They felt they were being told that if they did not vote for termination, they would be terminated anyway; and that if they did vote for termination, they would be terminated, but would receive payments which would temporarily enrich them.

If we visit upon the Menominees the notion that they received personal payment before from the Federal Government or that they received it with the Federal Government acting as agency, and that they dissipated the payment,

that is not pertinent, for the reasons I shall proceed to state.

How well we recall the time in the 1930's when bonus payments were made to the veterans of World War I. How long were those bonus payments held by the veterans? Many of them invested them wisely, I am sure; but all of the studies I have seen have indicated that most of them spent their bonus payments within 2 or 3 months.

We are not asking that payments be made individually to these Indians, for their personal enrichment or so they can enjoy themselves for a few weeks. We are asking that the payment be made to the State, so this will be done in an orderly, responsible, and humane way. That is the burden of our request.

Mr. CHURCH. And, let me add, it is for the reason that the committee has made available to the tribe, to assist it in the transition and to enable it to get the full use from its sawmill and from its forest resources, the credit of $1,500,000, which, from the testimony, would seem to be adequate to modernize the plant, to diversify the industry, and to develop the recreational facilities. We believe this is a sum which the testimony itself supports; and, therefore, we have concluded that with this money, together with the grant of money necessary to complete the sanitation facilities, the Menominee Indians will have the wherewithal to improve their sawmill and to develop their recreational areas, and therefore, to improve their general condition of life. It is also our feeling that in the long run—now that termination has occurred—the mill will be better utilized and the living standards of the Menominee Indians will continue to improve.

We were unable to agree with the House that grants should be given for education, health, and welfare, because it seemed to us that once termination had occurred and once these Indians had the same status, in connection with the Federal Government, as that of any other citizens, we would be setting a very unwise precedent then to use Federal funds by way of grants to the State or to the county for purposes which normally are taken care of by the State and the county.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will yield further, that is why I wanted termination itself to be ended on a more gradual basis, as the Department of the Interior itself recommended, so it would be possible to make these payments. But it was the decision of the committee that it did not wish to concur in the view of the senior Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from Wisconsin, but, instead, wished to have termination occur and wished to cut off Federal aid completely.

Mr. CHURCH. That was clearly the view and the case. Unfortunately, time moves inexorably onward; and it was the decision of the committee to report the bill without extending the termination date.

Now termination has occurred, and that fact has been established; and, therefore, at this time the Indians should not be treated differently from the way in which other citizens are treated, and we must take that situation into account, and must consider it in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 188, House bill 4130, the corresponding House bill—in other words, that it be substituted for the Senate bill—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. And I also move that the Senate strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and substitute therefor the text of the Senate bill, as thus far amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I seek a little information in regard to the pending motion.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senate has now adopted the committee amendment as amended, to Senate bill 870.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator move that the House bill be substituted?

Mr. CHURCH. I have made that motion, and it is pending.

Mr. WILEY. Then the pending question is on agreeing to the motion to take up the House bill?

Mr. CHURCH. No; my motion is that the Senate now consider the House bill, and that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out, and that in lieu thereof there be inserted the text of the Senate bill, as thus far amended.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the motion is in order. It seems to me it is a combination of two motions—namely, a motion to take up the House bill, and then a motion to substitute, for the text of the House bill, the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order, although it may be divided, if that is desired.

Mr. WILEY. I understand that the pending motion is to have the Senate take up the Senate bill, and substitute the text of the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suggest that the reverse is the case.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the first step will be to take up the House bill. After that is done, the Chair can put the question on substituting the text of the Senate bill, as amended, for all after the enacting clause of the House bill. On the latter question, my colleague and I can vote "no."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I adopt the suggestion, and modify my motion accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 4130.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4130) to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out, and that there be substituted therefor the text of Senate bill 870, as amended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that the text of Senate bill 870, as amended, be substituted for all after the enacting clause of House bill 4130. (Putting the question.)

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of House bill 4130.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4130) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 870 be indefinitely postponed.

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

Without objection, the title of House bill 4130 will be amended so as to correspond to the title of Senate bill 870, as proposed to be amended by the committee, as follows:

"A bill to provide for economic assistance to Menominee Enterprises, Incorporated, and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. ALLOTT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND TAX HAVEN OPERATIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have, on numerous occasions and over a period of years, spoken out in opposition to the U.S. tax treatment of the income and profits earned by foreign corporations which are owned by American interests. My objections run both to the fact that there is no taxation of the income of foreign subsidiaries of American companies prior to the repatriation of dividends

and to the fact that we credit foreign income and related taxes against U.S. income tax liability.

I have pointed out on several occasions that our tax treatment of this income earned abroad has led to balance of payments difficulties, the shifting of the tax burden to those businesses engaged solely in domestic operations, the loss of jobs here at home, and, perhaps most outrageous to our sense of equity and fair play, the growth of numerous tax haven abuses.

Today I want to discuss a few aspects of the magnitude and extent of the foreign investment problem, with particular reference to the inadequacy of our statistics, following which I shall discuss some matters relating to the extent and seriousness of tax haven abuses.

In my view, these tax haven operations have even led some companies into practices which interfere with, rather than assist in, the promotion of exports and the conduct of operations both domestically and abroad in a sound, ethical, and businesslike manner. I shall illustrate this point by citing some facts relative to a particular corporation.

On April 4 of this year I sent a letter and questionnaire to the presidents of our 100 largest industrial corporations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and questionnaire printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEAR MR. ———: Recently I have had occasion to look into certain aspects of private foreign investment. I find our statistics fairly good on direct investment but the portfolio picture is not at all clear.

As you know, direct investment is, by definition, equity investment amounting to at least 25 percent of ownership. According to some indications, there are sizable investments abroad by nonfinancial U.S. corporations, both in equities where ownership amounts to less than 25 percent, and in evidences of indebtedness of one kind or another.

I am sending the attached questionnaire to several of our major nonfinancial corporations in an effort to obtain some clarification of the foreign portfolio investment picture.

Your cooperation will be sincerely appreciated and I shall hold this information in confidence insofar as the operations of any specific company are concerned.

It is hoped that this information will be helpful in developing tax legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

* * * * *

Page 1 of questionnaire: Does your company, or any U.S. corporation in which your company holds voting stock amounting to as much as 10 percent of the total voting stock of such corporation, own equity shares of stock in a foreign corporation? If so, please list below (please list separately for each U.S. corporation).

U.S. Corporation:

Foreign corporation:

Approximate percentage of ownership of foreign corporation held by this U.S. corporation:

---

* * * * *

Pages 2 of questionnaire: In which of these foreign corporations has any of the U.S. corporations listed acquired stock initially since 1956? In how many has the percentage of ownership increased since 1956?

U.S. corporation:

Foreign corporation:

Date initially acquired, or percentage of increase since 1956:

---

* * * * *

Page 3 of questionnaire: Please list below any nonequity investment or evidences of indebtedness of a foreign corporation held by these same U.S. corporations.

U.S. corporation:

Foreign corporation:

Approximate dollar amount of nonequity investment:

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am glad to say that the response was good. Altogether, responses from 78 companies were received, although not all gave all the information desired. Approximately 60 companies furnished substantially all the information sought. Some, however, made little effort to be of assistance.

The president of one of our large companies finally wrote to me on May 19, a delay of some 6 weeks, not to give me any information, but to suggest that I consult the Department of Commerce publication, "U.S. Business Investments in Foreign Countries."

Now, I am familiar with most of the standard publications in this field. The one referred to was published in 1960 and covers only the year 1957, and subsequent trends was a part of the information sought. Incidentally, I shall later refer to this publication and compare some of the findings contained therein with some of our other published statistics. Government statistics in this field are inadequate. Secretary Dillon, for example, pointed out to the Ways and Means Committee recently that, although official information returns indicate that there are only 92 U.S.-owned corporations in Switzerland altogether, there have been, in fact, more than 500 discovered there.

I selected the top 100 industrial corporations for this questionnaire because I felt that this was the best way to get a look at the foreign operations of a typical cross section of our industrial corporations. Some of these companies have no foreign operations at all. Many, such as the petroleum and minerals companies, operate abroad largely in branch form. Any specialized list I might have used as a sample would likely have been heavily weighted in one direction or another.

In my letter to the presidents of these corporations, I promised to hold their replies in confidence insofar as the operations of any individual corporations were concerned. This I am doing. Their replies are in my safe. I would like to share with my colleagues, however, for whatever value there may be in it, some of the summary results of this study. Some important conclusions, I feel, may be drawn.

I have a tabulation of some of the points brought out in the responses to my questionnaire. The companies are arranged in order of responses received, not by size or alphabetically.

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

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

Company	Number of foreign subsidiaries in which ownership amounts to more than 25 percent of voting stock	Number in which ownership acquired or percentage of ownership increased in period 1957–60	Number of foreign subsidiaries in which ownership amounts to less than 25 percent of voting stock	Number in which ownership acquired or percentage of ownership increased in period 1957–60	Nonequity investment, long-term loans, advances, etc. (millions)
C-1	12	3	1	1	$15.8.
C-2	25	2	3	1	$2.2.
C-3	6	5	4	4	$0.1.
C-4	Several indicated, but not named.	1	11	4	$33.0.
C-5	do	Not reported	4	Not reported	Not reported.
C-6	11	2	0	0	None.
C-7	19	9	0	0	$0.2.
C-8	42	7	0	0	$7.8.
C-9	26	5	0	0	$3.7.
C-10	7	1	6	2	
C-11			No useful information given.		
C-12	25	7	2	1	$16.7.
C-13	17 (majority)	9	10 (minority)	1	Indicates substantial amount but no figure given.
C-14	2	2	0	0	
C-15	11	10	0		$19.1.
C-16	17	5	0	0	$24.4.
C-17			Several indicated. None named.		
C-18			Several indicated. None named.		
C-19	98	27	0	0	Substantial but no figure given.
C-20	1	0	0	0	
C-21	4	1	0	0	Open account balances, very substantial. No figures given.

Company	Number of foreign subsidiaries in which ownership amounts to more than 25 percent of voting stock	Number in which ownership acquired or percentage of ownership increased in period 1957–60	Number of foreign subsidiaries in which ownership amounts to less than 25 percent of voting stock	Number in which ownership acquired or percentage of ownership increased in period 1957–60	Nonequity investment, long-term loans, advances, etc. (millions)
C-22	10	0	0	0	
C-23		Stated only one "unimportant" subsidiary. Branch operations.			Not reported.
C-24	18	13	2	1	$1.4.
C-25	Several indicated, but not named.	0	5	3	Open account balances. No figures given.
C-26	5	3	1	0	$2.4.
C-27	Not reported	None indicated	1	None indicated	$9.8.
C-28	16	8	0	0	$3.8.
C-29			None indicated.		
C-30	Several indicated, but not named.	Not reported	0	0	Some indicated, but amount not reported.
C-31	do	do	0	0	Amount not indicated.
C-32	7	3	2	2	$5.0.
C-33	25	10	0	0	$23.9.
C-34	1	0	1	0	
C-35	31	7	0	0	
C-36	13	3	0	0	$0.4.
C-37	4	4	0	0	
C-38	2	0	1	0	
C-39	10	9	2	2	$6.4.
C-40	2	0	0	0	$1.6.
C-41	16	8	0	0	$10.3.
C-42	20	7	4	0	$0.3.
C-43	1	1	0	0	$3.6.
C-44	Several indicated, but not named.	0	1	1	
C-45		None indicated			
C-46	10	3	3	0	$0.5
C-47		None indicated			
C-48	6	2	0	0	$16.4.
C-49	6	3	0	0	$3.0.
C-50	4	0	0	0	
C-51	1	1	0	0	
C-52	Several indicated, but not named.	0	4	1	$5.0.
C-53	do		2	2	Some indicated, but no amount given.
C-54	2	0	0	0	
C-55		None indicated			
C-56	20	2	0	0	$0.3.
C-57	None	0	3	0	$5.2.
C-58	2	0	0	0	$1.5.
C-59	1	1	0	0	$0.2.
C-60			Incomplete.		
C-61	15	15	11	Not indicated	$3.6 (plus customers' notes).
C-62	Several indicated, but not named.		14	3	$13.4.
C-63	3	3	0	0	
C-64	3	Not indicated	0	0	$11.1.
C-65	Several indicated, but not named.	1	4	2	Some indicated, but no amount given.
C-66	12	1	1	0	Not indicated.
C-67	8	3	0	0	$33.8.
C-68	Several indicated, but not named.	0	0	0	$5.0.
C-69			No useful information given.		
C-70	5	4	0	0	$13.3.
C-71	1	1	0	0	$14.6.
C-72	26	16	2	2	$1.3.
C-73	8	8	2	2	$1.5.
C-74	13	6	2	1	$5.2.
C-75			No useful information given.		
C-76			No useful information given.		
C-77	48	13	1	0	None indicated.
C-78	19	5	8	3	$13.9.

Mr. GORE. Here are some points of significance to me.

The number of foreign subsidiaries of our industrial corporations is much larger than generally thought. The above tabulation shows 834 foreign subsidiaries, but these are only the ones actually designated by name by the comparatively few companies that constitute this summary report. In many cases, the foreign subsidiaries of domestic subsidiaries of these companies were not reported. In still other cases the foreign subsidiaries of the foreign subsidiaries listed were not named. On the basis of available information, I would estimate that these 100 U.S. industrial corporations have a substantial equity interest in at least 2,000 foreign corporations. Some are merely holding companies and have no intrinsic worth, although many have accumulated large amounts of cash or other assets. Some represent substantial manufacturing operations in Europe, Canada, and Latin America. Some represent American companies' participation in syndicates engaged in petroleum operations in the Middle East, although, as I have said, most of our foreign petroleum and minerals operations are carried out in branch form.

Of the 834 subsidiaries reported by name, it was indicated that in the case of 300, or 35 percent, the subsidiary had been originally purchased or established, or the percentage of ownership had been increased, during the period 1957–60. This means that for every two subsidiaries in existence prior to 1957 there is now one additional new subsidiary, or one in which additional new investment has been made.

Bear in mind that some of these foreign investments go back for 100 years and more. Indeed, in the case of one of the domestic corporations reporting, the American company itself has grown out of what was, in the beginning, a small subsidiary of a British corporation established in this country almost 100 years ago.

This recent increase in foreign subsidiaries must arrest our attention.

It indicates two things.

First, there has been an amazing increase in private foreign economic activities in recent years. This increase in subsidiaries indicates a greater stepup in activity than do our recorded figures for increased direct foreign investment.

Second, this sharp increase in subsidiaries indicates that there has been a great deal of reorganizing of oversea operations. Other studies, taken in conjunction with this one, show a large increase in the numbers of subsidiaries in tax haven countries. Many of these, I am convinced, are primarily for the purpose of tax avoidance or deferral. For instance, according to Treasury Department sources, 170 additional subsidiaries have been discovered in Switzerland during the past year. Many of these are holding companies. Many are dummy operations of one kind or another. Some front for Liechtenstein, Panamanian, Venezuelan, or other third country corporations.

Incidentally, a new country has recently been added to the active tax haven rolls. I refer to Monaco. U.S. News & World Report for June 12, 1961, indicates that Monaco is trying to attract U.S. operations and that Joy Manufacturing, United States Time Corp. and Inter-Armco have established management and sales headquarters there. This is the terminology often used to describe a tax haven operation.

Another significant point brought out by these responses to my questionnaire is the sizable amount of nondirect investment. This is important when studying our statistics on capital outflow and balance of payments.

There are 118 subsidiaries included in the above tabulation which are in the nondirect category, according to Commerce Department classification. There are also large amounts of bonds, notes, long-term credit, and open account credit either explicitly stated or implied. These items have considerable significance in our balance-of-payments statistics.

These amounted to more than $340 million worth explicitly stated, with other amounts in sizable quantities indicated.

Some of the loans, where details were given, are ICA participation or guaranteed loans, many being made to the U.S. companies' own subsidiaries. Most of this amount appears to be of rather recent origin.

There are sizable loans to customers to finance recent purchases, apparently on a long-term basis.

There are loans to apparently nonaffiliated foreign companies.

The above points are important, and they do not show up from a study of our regularly published statistics.

These nonequity investments show that, for one thing, when we export machinery and equipment, we do not realize the full effect on our balance of payments because credits are extended at the same time by the exporting company; in other words, the goods are not paid for. We do not get the full effect, either, when 20 percent, or more, of the sale price of exports is bled off into a tax haven sales corporation.

U.S. Government statistics on capital outflow and balance of payments are incomplete and misleading. This will require some explanation, and I hope my colleagues will bear with me.

Our capital outflows are classified as either direct or portfolio. Direct investment is what we generally think of when we talk about corporate activities overseas, particularly when we speak of the subsidiary and branch operations of our domestic industrial, as distinguished from financial, corporations.

But this is not altogether a true picture when we consider our regularly published statistics.

The Commerce Department compiles direct investment statistics on the basis of questionnaires sent out quarterly to about 459 companies of various types. Some companies do not respond. Most, however, I am told, cooperate very well. These responses are not available to me for study, however, and the results appear only in extrapolated, aggregate statistics.

Another rather unsatisfactory aspect of these reports and the resulting statistics is the cut-off point of 25 percent ownership. If an American corporation owns less than 25 percent of a foreign subsidiary, this investment is not included in the Commerce Department statistics as direct investment. This results in a smaller than actual outflow of capital being reported. The Treasury is supposed to get statistics on nondirect and other portfolio investment, but there is doubt in my mind as to how good Treasury figures are in the area of industrial subsidiaries. Treasury's contacts are primarily with investment and banking institutions.

Theoretically, nonequity advances to subsidiaries would be included in direct investment if such advances are made to a subsidiary in which the domestic corporation owns more than 25 percent. I have grave doubts as to the inclusion of a great deal of these amounts.

Our procedures are inadequate, and the composition of the sample of companies is out of date.

What is really needed, I might say parenthetically, is a basic statistics law, with a central agency such as the Bureau of the Budget deciding what statistics are needed by Government agencies. Reporting should be compulsory but, at the same time, reports should be made to one agency so that various companies are not constantly being harassed by multiple requests.

In addition to the general inadequacy of our whole recording and reporting system, which would indicate the likelihood of poor statistics resulting, the statistics themselves show by internal examination that they are unreliable.

There is always a very large figure which is required to balance our international accounts statistics. This item formerly was called errors and omissions, but in recent years this figure has been labeled unrecorded transactions—errors and omissions. This is an entirely arbitrary figure. It is too large to make any statistician happy with the other figures it arbitrarily balances.

An interesting thing about this figure is that, in 1960, it took a terrific swing of a $1.8 billion, from a plus $783 million to a minus $1 billion or more. This was widely interpreted as the result of unrecorded "hot money" flows. Some of it undoubtedly was. But the Treasury gets fairly good reports from financial institutions on "hot money."

My studies lead me to believe that a great deal of this swing came about through unreported extensions of credit on our greatly expanded exports, nonrepatriation of royalties and fees for various services collected and recorded but held in tax haven companies, and through the siphoning off of the proceeds of exports into tax haven subsidiaries. These amounts are generally well hidden and often not reported voluntarily to any Government agency.

Another verification of the inadequacy of our statistics can be found in the comparison of the direct investment capital outflow reported for the year 1957 in our regular statistics, and the figure reported in the detailed Commerce Department study for that year, a study which was based on compulsory reporting. The regular statistics show direct investment capital outflow for 1957 in the amount of $2.058 billion, while the more comprehensive study for the same year, but completed only last year, shows direct investment capital outflow for 1957 of "nearly $2½ billion, considerably larger than previously estimated." This is an error of about 20 percent on the low side in our regular statistics.

I bring up this point because of the fact that, in discussing the current taxation of subsidiaries, it is often pointed out to me that current taxation is not necessary from a balance-of-payments standpoint, because our direct investment operations show a net inflow of capital.

When our statistics are properly understood, we can readily see that our investment in subsidiary operations is not paying off adequately currently.

These operations definitely show a net outflow of capital.

To begin with, if we had proper statistics, we would have a larger recorded direct investment capital outflow. But, let us suppose for the moment that our statistics are valid. What do they tell us?

Bear in mind that, in discussing the return on investment, we are talking about the return on the cumulative foreign investment which has been built up over the period of our entire national existence. Looking at domestic corporate investment as a guide to what we should expect, we see that in 1960 dividends from domestic corporations amounted to $14 billion, while new money going into domestic corporations, that is, net new issues, amounted to $8 billion. On this basis, then, we should be getting currently about 75 percent more in direct investment income from abroad than our direct investment capital outflow.

We are not doing this, even when we lump subsidiary and branch operations together. On the basis of these understated outflows, however, we have been getting back about 55 percent more in direct investment income than our direct investment capital outflow.

But this inflow includes both branch and subsidiary operations. After all, branch profits are generally repatriated and are taxed currently. There is little inclination to try to hide these profits, since they are mostly from petroleum and minerals operations and these operations, when the foreign tax credit and the iniquitous percentage-depletion allowance are both combined, pay practically no U.S. tax, anyway.

But let us look at the net return from subsidiary operations. This is what is of concern to me. This is clearly negative in character, that is, outflow of capital in recent years has exceeded the return on this accumulated investment.

According to U.S. Treasury figures, during the period 1957–60, capital outflow to Western European subsidiaries amounted to $1.7 billion, while inflow

from the accumulated investment in these subsidiaries amounted to $1.3 billion. Canadian operations show a similar ratio. This inadequate return on subsidiary investment is caused by reinvestment of funds abroad, plus a bleeding off of profits, royalties and fees into tax havens.

The only way to insure adequate repatriation of oversea earnings is to tax such earnings and profits currently.

Putting aside, for the time being, balance-of-payments considerations, numerous tax haven abuses are encouraged—and are being practiced to an alarming degree—by our faulty tax laws.

These practices include siphoning off into tax havens the proceeds from export sales, the retention abroad in tax haven subsidiaries of licensing fees and royalties, manipulating the purchase price of imports purchased through tax haven subsidiaries, transferring profits from foreign manufacturing activities into tax haven subsidiaries, and various financial manipulations, including several different types in the field of reinsurance. I am sure there are others I have not yet uncovered.

In my view, tax haven abuses can be fully corrected only by taxing currently the profits of all foreign subsidiaries.

I have referred to these manipulations on previous occasions on the floor of the Senate. Now I would like to give my colleagues some facts concerning the operations of a particular corporation which does a fairly large export business and show some of the results of tax haven operations. I might say that this company is not one of the 100 involved in the study previously discussed.

This corporation is a combination holding company and operating company. Domestically it operates principally through 11 subsidiaries and divisions, each performing separate functions in a well-integrated service for one of our leading industries. Many of these subsidiaries were formerly independent companies, and all retain a high degree of autonomy in both their domestic and their oversea operations. Nine of the eleven have their own separate export sales organizations based in the United States. This diverse corporate organization complicates this company's tax haven operations, as I shall explain.

The foreign operations of this corporation consist largely of promoting exports of its equipment and machinery manufactured in the United States, and in the collection of royalties and licensing and service fees from foreign companies using its processes or manufacturing some of its equipment.

The foreign structure is complicated, but no more so than many similar companies.

There are 27 subsidiaries and 7 branches in 11 different countries. Nine of these, in the words of a corporate official, "exist for tax purposes, or because of currency regulations." These foreign subsidiaries and branches maintain 105 bank accounts in 47 different banks.

There are 7 subsidiaries designed specifically for "tax savings"—again I am quoting a corporate official—in my terminology, tax "avoidance," to say the least of it. And the taxes "saved" or "avoided," as the case may be, are not only U.S. taxes, but often the taxes of other foreign countries as well. This does not improve the American image abroad.

Perhaps my colleagues can see in this rather complicated organization some basis for internal confusion, as well as poor customer relations.

Parkinson's law appeared to run rampant in this instance. Administrative and selling expense increased from $23.5 million in 1953 to $44.6 million in 1959, an increase of 90 percent. During that same period sales increased only 47 percent. And net profits only 19 percent.

The tax haven operations center around three key subsidiaries, although others play a part. One of these is located in Liechtenstein and two are in Switzerland. The Liechtenstein company derives its income from the collection of commissions on exports and the collection of royalties and licensing fees. The Swiss companies front for the Liechtenstein company, one of them being used to pass through to Liechtenstein royalties and fees collected.

The Liechtenstein subsidiary receives a commission of 20 percent on all sales made by the U.S. corporation and its subsidiaries to all foreign areas outside Canada. It does practically nothing to earn these commissions, since most sales are made by outside agents or by U.S.-based export sales personnel. It also receives 80 percent of all licensing fees and royalties. It does little or nothing to earn these sizable amounts. It does have on its payroll one accountant in Liechtenstein. In my view, transferring these funds, actually earned by a U.S. company, to a foreign corporation for tax avoidance purposes constitutes fraud.

Practically no tax is assessed against this Liechtenstein subsidiary, which makes Liechtenstein highly desirable for this type of operation. On the other hand, a Liechtenstein address is not considered entirely respectable in all circles, it is not so easily accessible, and Liechtenstein lacks many of the facilities of Zurich. So the other Swiss subsidiary fronts for the Liechtenstein operation in customer relations.

This Swiss company does the advertising, keeps the office, handles correspondence, and entertains customers, but at the same time it must prevent customers from paying any proceeds into it. This confuses some customers, as well as some corporate employees, and it is felt by some officers of the corporation that this type of operation has led to loss of some sales.

To take care of sales in Latin America, there was a Western Hemisphere trade corporation subsidiary. Now, bear in mind that this subsidiary was taxed at the rate of only 38 percent, and yet it was felt by some in the corporation organization that their tax avoidance in the tax havens has been so successful that the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation should be collapsed. This has now been done.

Now, this is not one of our larger corporations, but its attorneys have estimated that these, to me rather bogus, tax haven operations have "saved" the company over $6 million in U.S. taxes during the period 1953–60, and are currently "saving" U.S. taxes at the rate of more than $600,000 per year.

If this is the case, I would say that this company has "avoided" rather than "saved" a large part of this amount and the Internal Revenue Service ought to be able to recover at least part of it under provisions of section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code. Furthermore, because the tax haven companies are not really earning the profits credited to them, these U.S. taxes may be, in fact and law, "evaded."

This company has run into internal difficulties. Its tax haven operation is complicated by the fact that all its subsidiaries and divisions have a high degree of autonomy. Intracorporate squabbles have developed. The legal department has tried to run the foreign operation, rather than letting it be run by operational and sales personnel. As a result, there has been a lack of efficiency and a probable loss of a great many sales abroad which could have been made in the absence of such concentration on the deviousness required by tax considerations. Customers were often confused as to just what organization they were dealing with and who was responsible.

Obviously, with the bleeding off of such substantial sums into the tax haven subsidiaries, either the prices of its exports were unnecessarily high, or the domestic parent corporation was not showing the profit it should have shown.

An attorney for this corporation has stated, in writing, according to my information, that the Liechtenstein-Swiss operation was "a tax 'gimmick' and nothing more." He appeared to be constantly pleading with all concerned to give an appearance of substance, "decorating," and "window dressing" to the operation, else the company had only a "50–50 chance" of making this tax avoidance stick.

Some officers of the corporation pointed out repeatedly that the apparent savings in taxes were being lost through inefficient oversea operations and a consequent loss of export sales.

One sidelight is worthy of mention. This company has apparently been overstating its earnings to its stockholders. In its annual report to stockholders, it issues a consolidated report. This report appears to include earnings of its tax haven subsidiaries, but makes no allowance for U.S. taxes due and unpaid on these earnings. It would appear that 1959 dividends were partially paid out of increased borrowings from insurance companies, although the dividends, on the surface, were supported by this highly questionable, and to me fraudulent, bookkeeping.

Things got so bad that an attorney for the company, at one point, strongly suggested to top management that any contemplated terminations be handled in such a way as to make those separated available as "friendly witnesses" in case of Internal Revenue Service action.

To date, the Internal Revenue Service has not brought this company to taw.

I have additional details concerning this company's actions and operations, but enough has been stated here to support certain conclusions. Some, or all, of these conclusions can be drawn relative to this company and to others following similar tax haven practices. Here are my conclusions:

First. Our tax laws encourage artificial organization and operations, if not outright fraud, in private foreign investment activities.

Second. Some companies are going to great lengths and engaging in sharp practices to attempt to avoid taxation, both United States and foreign. There is a strong indication that resulting complications are losing sales and reducing exports.

Third. Export products are, in many instances, being priced unnecessarily high, sometimes virtually priced out of the foreign markets.

Fourth. General mismanagement and increased overhead result from attempts to avoid taxation through tax haven operations.

Fifth. Top management of some of our larger corporations give too little attention to production and sales, concentrating primarily on financial manipulations.

Sixth. The ethics displayed often parallel the sorry spectacle we have recently seen unfolded in price fixing among electrical manufacturers.

Seventh. Companies indulging in the practices I have outlined present a poor image of American free enterprise both at home and abroad. Such freebooters will, unless brought to taw, surely destroy our free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I have spoken out on many occasions against our faulty tax laws. In many instances our faulty laws merely result in loss of revenue. In others, there is a more obvious and specific inequity, due to a shifting of the tax burden. In still others, as in the case I have cited, practices are encouraged which are, in the long run, harmful to American business and to the companies themselves which try to cut all possible corners.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to study carefully our tax treatment of income earned abroad and to be prepared to vote on some amendments in this area later during this session of the Congress.

TELEVISION CONTROVERSY: THE MYSTERY OF THE MISSING CROSBY COLUMNS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, freedom of speech and press are among the basic tenets of our free society. The Founding Fathers provided these liberties in the first amendment to the Constitution as a safeguard against governmental interference with those inalienable rights. Unfortunately, despite this safeguard, these freedoms may be limited, jeopardized or nullified by restrictions and censorships other than governmental.

In point are two recent articles by John Crosby, the well-known, able newspaper commentator on radio and television, whose columns are scheduled to appear in the New York Herald-Tribune and are also syndicated by that paper to newspapers throughout the country. Recently, two columns by Mr. Crosby were suppressed, or, in newspaper parlance, killed by the management of the paper. Not only that, but instructions were sent out to the newspapers which receive this column as a syndicated feature to suppress it.

It so happened that Mr. Crosby was expressing some views which were distasteful to certain elements in the radio and television industry. Yet his views expressed a widely prevailing discontent with some of the TV fare presented to the public.

One of the regrettable concomitants of our increasing concentration of the avenues of expression, so vital in a free society such as ours, is that newspaper publishers likewise own radio stations. In many communities a total control of all such media of news, opinions, and information is vested in a single individual. It is apparent that what Mr. Crosby wrote so forthrightly and so usefully was distasteful to one beneficiary of this type of dual ownership.

I think it is therefore desirable to give currency to two of Mr. Crosby's excellent expressions of his opinion which were denied to the readers of the Herald-Tribune and to its syndicated customers; the first being entitled: "I Am Against Rape," which was scheduled to be printed in the Herald-Tribune on May 17, and a second article "Whose Air Is It, Anyway?", scheduled for printing and dispatch to other dailies on May 22.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles by Mr. Crosby, as well as an editorial from the June 12 issue of the New Republic entitled: "Public Defender Minow," which explains pretty clearly what the controversy between the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and the TV industry is about, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

I'M AGAINST RAPE

(By John Crosby)

I'm getting tired of rape. I hate to be such a square about rape but I just don't like it. God knows, I've tried. I saw the movie, "the Virgin Spring," which contained the most explicit rape scene I've ever seen. The other night I saw "Two Women," an Italian picture, which had a mother and daughter raped. They both made me sick.

As a matter of fact, I think men are more sensitive than women on the subject. During the rape scene in "Two Women," three people got up and hurriedly left the theater. All of them were men. Conceivably, the women were too shellshocked to move. Just the same, "Two Women," rape and all, is doing extremely good business, God knows why. It isn't much of a picture and it is a very depressing one.

Sadism is certainly the stuff that sells, books, movies, television. There seems to be no end to it and no bottom. And each year it gets worse. I recall when rape was handled in the newspaper with extreme delicacy and rarely. It was not considered fit for newspapers and certainly not for entertainment.

But now sadism is not only the bulwark of 90 percent of popular entertainment but any effort to stop it is promptly howled down. I was particularly interested in the reaction to FCC Chairman Newton Minow's speech castigating television as a wasteland. Television is a wasteland and much of this wasteland is given over to sheer senseless brutality. Well, to take a typical example of the wasteland, Richard Boone in a very recent "Have Gun, Will Travel" mowed down three 15-year-old boys, justifying this massacre by saying that boys shouldn't play with guns.

This, as I say, is typical of television entertainment. Of television's 73½ hours of prime time, that sort of sickening violence is on the air most of the time. Every year it gets worse and there gets more of it. We are in a sense teaching children debauchery, brutalizing their instincts, 73½ hours a week in prime evening time.

When a public official like Minow decries this viciousness, he's accused of attempting Government censorship. Critical disdain is dismissed as a matter of personal taste.

Both of these views miss the point. As far as editorial judgment in general goes, most television is beneath contempt and out of the range of criticism. (Ninety percent of television doesn't get criticized because what on earth can you say about "Have Gun, Will Travel"? You don't criticize comic books. How can you criticize television?)

The question of censorship is a more ticklish one. Nobody will come out for censorship. Isn't this an infringement on freedom? the TV propagandists ask. Isn't this a curtailment of free enterprise? Are you in favor of curtailing free enterprise, Senator?

This is pretty much the opposition that the propagandists (and they are very skillful and well paid) have put up to those of us who are in favor of the FCC regulating what it was set up to regulate. I'm for self-restraint rather than censorship. But since there is no evidence that the TV industry or the advertisers who support it plan any self-restraint now or ever, then I'm in favor of the Government stepping in and imposing some limits.

The trouble is we are all getting too complicated and too legalistic for our own good. The state of television is a very simple matter really and it should be looked at simply. It stinks. There is absolutely nothing that Newton Minow said that is not glaringly obvious to any 6-year-old child. Anyone who argues against Minow's picture of television is: (a) someone who hasn't looked at it in years; (b) in the business himself such as a broadcaster or sponsor or a lawyer or publicist for it and therefore an unreliable witness; (c) senile.

The issue has been put as one between the Government and the people. Aw, come off it, fellows. What people? I'm people and I think most of television is inexcusable. Most of the people who look at it are severely critical of it. Or to get back to that rape scene, the theater was jammed (and there was a line blocks long to get in and see the picture), but does that imply that all those people approve of rape?

WHOSE AIR IS IT, ANYWAY?

(By John Crosby)

In characterizing television as a vast wasteland and spelling out just what he meant by wasteland, FCC Chairman Newton Minow was only reporting what any set owner could ascertain for himself if he were foolish enough and strong stomached enough to sit in front of his set for 72 hours. The results have been catastrophic and ironic.

First, the public rallied almost to a man behind Minow. Second, and notwithstanding, the House of Representatives rallied almost to a man behind the broadcasting industry which has one of the most effective

lobbies in Washington. It is always a shock to discover that ours is not at all a representative government in matters of this kind. The FCC has reported an outpouring of letters concerning the Minow speech. Only about 35 were unfavorable. The trouble is the voters should have written their Congressmen, not Minow.

The Congressmen were subjected to a much more direct, effective, clamorous, and personal intervention from broadcasters, who were half way up Capitol Hill before Minow even sat down. Let us say a broadcaster owns WXXQ in East Overshoe, Nebr. He may also own the East Overshoe Bugle, which is the only newspaper in town. He may also be a heavy campaign contributor. In short, a powerful man. Also, he's right there in the office. The voter (and/or viewer) is way back in East Overshoe.

Consequently, when the broadcaster said to his Congressman, "chastise Minow," the Congress listened deferentially. As this is written, it looks almost certain that the House will defeat the reorganization of the FCC recommended by James Landis and seconded by Chairman Minow.

This would be a bloody shame because it is a good and much needed reorganization plan. The FCC has been for many years either inert or downright crooked or both. Mostly inert. The broadcasting industry would like to keep it that way. As it is, the broadcaster has what amounts to a license to steal, with the least possible supervision operating exclusively in its own rather than in the public interest.

In spite of the initial setback in Washington, I hope Minow sticks to his guns. Both press (about 75 percent applauded) and public to an extraordinary degree are on his side. The public reaction supports what I've long held: that television is not a popular medium; it is a highly unpopular one.

Just because people look at television doesn't mean they approve what they see or don't want something better—especially for their children. The broadcasting industry, far from being responsible to the public, is increasingly impervious to it. Where do you register protest? There is no box office. The rating services are paid for by the broadcasters and consequently tell the broadcaster what he wants to hear.

It's a simple issue really; namely, that the diversity, excellence, and purpose of TV programing are at an alltime low this year. There is a public for good programing and increasingly there is a pocketbook for it. The advertiser, looking for good programs, is increasingly thwarted by the broadcaster who wants only high-rated junk on his network. That's where the money is. Representative OREN HARRIS has told the networks they have complete charge to set their house in order. But instead of doing that, the networks have simply demanded ownership or part ownership of television programs as a price for putting them on the air.

In the middle of this sordid commerce, it's heartening to applaud my favorite sponsor, Joyce T. Hall, president of Hallmark, whose "Macbeth" this year won five Emmys. Hall has always been my favorite sponsor because he has put only high-quality programs—Shakespeare and opera mostly—on the air. These have been both artistic and whopping commercial successes.

What social conscience there is in broadcasting these days is coming largely from sponsors—Purex, Firestone, Bell & Howell, Chrysler, Kent cigarettes—have I forgotten anyone?

In siding with the broadcaster, I must emphatically remind the honorable gentlemen of Congress they are not striking a blow for freedom but one against freedom of choice. They are, in short, endorsing cowboys and cops 'n' robbers and voting against excellence.

PUBLIC DEFENDER MINOW

Newton N. Minow's maiden speech as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission was the clearest "meme, mene, tekel, upharsin" the television industry has been given. But the tentative network programing for next season indicates that the public is doomed to suffer through more of the predictable violence, sadism, sex, puerile commercials and assorted hokum, slapstick and claptrap, with only a slight leavening of quality.

Of the cumulative 73.5 hours of prime evening time per week, the three major networks plan to devote 59 hours, or almost six-sevenths, to "action-adventure" shows, situation comedy, variety and quiz shows and movies—the kind of lowest common denominator that led the new FCC chairman, in his rousing speech before the National Association of Broadcasters, to describe TV as a "vast wasteland" notable for implausibility, offensiveness and boredom.

The industry has moved quickly to block Minow's efforts to improve programing, and in this cause, it will have the cooperation of many members of Congress. At least 15 Senators and Representatives have direct or indirect financial interests in commercial radio or TV stations. The figure was considerably higher a few years ago—before the congressional investigation of payola, rigged quiz shows, and the like.

Under pressure from the industry, to which freedom to make money takes precedence over the public's right not to be insulted, the House Government Operations Committee last month voted to reject the first new weapon sought by Minow—a reorganization plan to streamline FCC procedures and increase the power of the Chairman. "We can't do the job with our present rules," Minow argued, but the committee—and an FCC majority—saw it differently.

Commissioners Ford, Hyde, Lee, and Bartley (the latter a nephew of Speaker SAM RAYBURN) opposed the provision giving the Chairman authority—if a majority of the Commission agreed—to delegate work to senior employees, examiners, and individual FCC members. The idea was to free the Commission as a whole from mandatory hearings on routine cases and give it more time for policymaking. The lack of attention to policy planning and coordination is one of the most serious defects of almost all the Federal regulatory agencies, the FCC included. The committee's action virtually assures that the FCC reorganization plan will be defeated.

Subsequently, Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, introduced legislation to do just about everything the FCC reorganization plan would have done. But the Harris bill contains a big, almost-unnoticed joker: A minority of three Commissioners could rescind any delegations of authority.

Beyond reorganization lies an even tougher problem. The FCC can regulate only individual radio and TV stations, not the huge networks which supply more than three-fourths of the programs shown in the prime hours. With its licensing power, the Commission can do something about programing by individual stations, but when the crackdown comes, the licensees will plead the strictures of economics—they must draw most of their big, popular programs from the networks. There can never be any big improvement in TV without some Federal supervision of the networks.

The Commission last year endorsed proposed legislation which would have put the networks under FCC regulation, but the amendment was withdrawn in the House when HARRIS said his committee would study the matter during this session. Reliable sources say, however, that no such inquiry has been scheduled and nothing is in prospect. It may be left to Senator KEFAUVER to skin the cat another way—by investigating the monopolistic character of television.

Minow, who at 35 is one of the brightest and most personable of the New Frontiersmen, believes that the television industry may win battles and still lose the war. His May 9 speech to the broadcasters brought a deluge of letters—about 3,500 thus far and only 5 or 6 percent of them hostile to his position. Of the letters analyzed to date 581 complained of too much liquor, crime, violence, and sex in their TV fare; 426 cited the adverse effect on children (Minow estimates that most youngsters now spend as much time watching TV as they do in the classroom), and 356 were worried about the effect on public morality.

THE NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH TO FOREIGN AID

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, two valuable appraisals of our foreign aid program are found in a recent article by John Kenneth Galbraith, nationally known and highly reputed economist, author of "The Affluent Society," and now our Ambassador to India, in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs, which makes constructive suggestions on how our foreign aid program can be materially improved, and in another useful bit of criticism in an address by Justice William O. Douglas, made to the students at Mount Holyoke College, Mass.

I hope that the administration will take note of these criticisms, now that hearings on foreign aid have begun, and that the reforms so sorely needed will be put into effect without fear or favor.

One other concomitant reform which does not depend on the administrators of the program but on the administration itself is the policy of the double standard which prevailed under the preceding administration. One reason that foreign aid has become increasingly unpopular is that the American people find it difficult to understand why basic projects for resource development, for conservation, for pollution control, for public works, and for other public needs have been frowned upon and eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget, yet far more generous projects have been scheduled for grants or loans of dubious validity in over 100 foreign countries.

Unless the double standard is repudiated and at least equal attention, if not priority, is given to domestic projects, it will be difficult, I fear, to persuade many Members of the Congress to vote vast sums for foreign aid, especially the additional sums and new long range commitments now being requested.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Ambassador Galbraith and Mr. Justice Douglas be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO ECONOMIC AID
(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

It is now nearly 12 years since the provision of economic assistance to other coun-

tries on a regular and organized basis became an established feature of American foreign policy. Such assistance had previously been offered to Latin American countries and during and after the war to the devastated and distressed countries of Europe and Asia. With the promulgation of the point IV offer in President Truman's inaugural message of 1949, the provision of assistance to other countries for their economic development lost its character of emergency relief. It became, instead, a settled arrangement for helping the less fortunate countries of the world to escape from poverty and to place themselves on a path to self-sustaining growth. The amounts being spent, if not huge, have at least become considerable: in the current fiscal year some $1.7 billion is available for loans, grants, technical assistance and administrative costs, and another $1.2 billion in surplus food and fiber. In addition, $250 million is provided for investment guarantees and $130 million for multilateral aid through the United Nations.

From the beginning, foreign aid has been sharply controversial. It has an aspect of good will and compassion that naturally arouses grave suspicion. Liberals, reacting to this, come automatically to its defense. Any criticism has been deemed to conceal some design for discrediting the policy. If results are not satisfactory, it is because we are not spending enough. The normal liberal formula for improving foreign aid is to spend about 25 percent more.

A much more careful view of foreign aid is now in order and, indeed, essential. Such a view does not lead to the conclusion that less should be spent. More money will be needed. But it does lead to the conclusion that much recent and present aid has been very ineffectually employed and for that reason has had gravely disappointing or even negative results. Without a substantial change in the whole view of economic development, the results in most cases will continue to be disappointing. The required changes will not perhaps be easily accepted here or abroad. Yet so great is the need for development and also the desire for it that we should not discount too severely the willingness to take the necessary steps.

The prime difficulty of present aid policy is that it is based on a convenient but largely erroneous view of the requirements for economic development. That economic development is a complex process will be agreed. When certain requirements for advance are present, advance will occur. If these are lacking, progress will be retarded. And if factors decisively important for progress are lacking, it follows that there will be no progress at all. As measured by movements in national income or product, the country will be stagnant.

In our present view of economic development, the missing element in all countries is assumed to be external resources—above all, capital. The country, being poor, has little national product from which to save and much need for current consumption. Accordingly, the chance for internal capital creation is small, and capital must, therefore, be supplied from the outside. This is the critical need. From the outside also, must come technicians and specialists to advise in the use and development of internal resources—to improve agriculture, search for oil, guide the exploitation of other natural resources, identify industrial opportunity, protect health, or plan education. The capital and the technicians, together with food, should this be lacking, we supply. Thus, it is thought, we contribute the missing and critical component of advance.

The difficulty is that what we supply is, in many cases, only one of the missing and critical requirements without which there will be no progress. At least four other things are crucial.

1. A substantial degree of literacy and that smaller number of people with the higher education and skills necessary to man a Government and undertake the managerial and technical tasks associated directly or indirectly with economic advance. We may lay it down as a rule that there will be no durable, self-sustaining advance under conditions of widespread illiteracy and ignorance and without an educated elite of substantial size. In the 18th and 19th centuries, it was well understood—at least in the United States—that popular education was of first importance for releasing the initiative and energy of the people, enabling them to work efficiently and progressively and to give development a thrust or impetus from below. There is no modern reason to believe that this view was wrong.

2. A substantial measure of social justice. If the ordinary individual receives no share in the advance, he will make no willing contribution to it. And he can normally be counted upon to sabotage it—to be careless of the new machinery entrusted to his care or contemptuous of the new methods recommended to his attention. It is not always easy to get the individual in the underdeveloped country to see and pursue the path of his own self-interest when it involves a break with tradition. He will never do so if all the gains accrue to feudal landlords or employers or to tax collectors, merchants and usurers.

3. A reliable apparatus of government and public administration. Clearly, economic development can occur only in a context of law and order, where persons and property are reasonably secure. But even though this is not always present, it is a good deal less than the minimum that is necessary. Positive advance also requires a capacity for more difficult tasks—for planning and building roads and other communications, for importing capital and guiding its use, for the management of a fiscal system that makes adequate use of internal resources, for organizing education, and for many other essential tasks.

4. A clear and purposeful view of what development involves. Development will not occur if it is believed to come automatically with escape from colonialism; if it is identified as a matter of course with faith in free enterprise or socialism; if it is regarded as the special magic that will be provided by a particular political personality; or if it is to be accomplished by some single stroke of genius such as the building of a particular road, the settling of a particular jungle, or the watering of a particular desert. In all instances, the result—not long deferred—will be serious disappointment.

In practice, one or more of these four factors is missing in most of the poor countries, and each is as critical as capital. Therefore, the only successful development will be that which supplies the missing elements. Since these will be somewhat different for different countries, there cannot be a common prescription for development; what works in one place will not work in another.

These conclusions readily survive empirical test. After a decade or more of effort and expenditure, we have a right to inquire whether the countries we have been aiding are on the way to self-sustaining advance. Has national income been increased?

Has poverty been mitigated? Has the likelihood of disorder been lessened? So far as Central America, northern South America, the Middle East, and some of Asia are concerned, the questions have a vaguely prejudicial sound. It is as though someone were preparing an indictment of foreign aid. In most of these regions poverty, ignorance, and the potentiality for disorder are just as great as they were 10 years ago. Ten years, it will be said, is too short a time. But this is a retrospective apology. When we announced our intention to embark on a bold new program to rescue the "more than half of the people of the world * * * living in conditions approaching misery," we had a better timetable in mind than this. And, in truth, a better one has been repeatedly promised to the Congress and the American people.

It may be true, as liberal defenders of foreign aid have argued, that the effort has been too small, but if other requirements for advance are absent an increase in size would not insure advance. Were ample assistance all that is required, Iran and the oil-rich Arab countries would be exceedingly progressive. In fact, in these countries progress remains unsatisfactory, and it is because other requirements for advance are missing. No one supposes that, were the oil revenues of Iraq doubled, the rate of economic development would be appreciably advanced. Similarly, Venezuela, in spite of its massive oil revenues, remains in uncertain equilibrium. Nor would economic aid in larger volume have saved the situation in Cuba or Laos.

The matter may be tested on the other side. One country that has shown a great advance since the war, including great capacity to make effective use of aid, has been Israel. It is singularly unendowed with natural resources. It has no oil wells, few minerals, insufficient water and not much space. But all of the four elements mentioned—high literacy and a highly educated elite, the sense and the reality of social justice, an effective government and a strong sense of purpose—are all present. So there is rapid progress. The Israelis, were they forced to it, would better do without their aid than without their education, their sense of shared responsibility and shared gain, their public administration and their clear view of their destiny.

India and Pakistan and perhaps also Ghana and Nigeria are other countries where the requirements of development other than external aid are present or largely present. Thus, India has a large literate minority and a highly educated elite, a considerable if still highly uneven measure of social justice, an effective administration and a fairly clear sense of direction. As a result, and despite the crushing problems imposed by tradition and population growth, India has been making a substantial measure of industrial progress. The fact that her agricultural progress has been far less impressive supports the point. In the agricultural villages literacy is low; the social inequality is high and many know that, come what may, they will live on the bare margin of subsistence; village government is decayed and ineffective and only recently have efforts at rejuvenation been made; and the Indian village is hardly inclined to address itself purposefully to economic advance. So even though India, of all the economically distressed countries, makes the best use of its aid, it too fails in the part of its economy where the other requirements for advance are lacking.

II

In our prescription for the improvement of other countries, we have a little-recognized but highly persistent tendency to advocate what exists in the United States, with no very critical view of its appropriateness to the situation or stage of development of the other country. In the early years of the Marshall plan, an agriculturist was moved by divine fire to seek to establish a land-grant college in Bavaria; his motivation was not need (and certainly not the availability of land) but the fact that land-grant colleges had served the United States well. A few years ago another American was bent on organizing a market news service for the floating vegetable market in Bangkok. And in Bolivia our agricultural experiment stations are so elaborate that they are (it is said) too expensive for the Bolivians to

operate; in the enthusiasm of the land reform of the early 1950's one of them was enthusiastically seized and divided up by peasants unaware of its function.

Our stress on the role of external resources has a similar bias. In modern times the supply of capital resources has been the limiting factor on our growth; the more capital, foreign and domestic, that we have had for investment, the more rapid our rate of advance. We even measure growth in part by our rate of investment in physical capital. We have tended to overlook the fact that at an earlier stage we had developed a system of popular education, and had achieved an effective system of public administration. We had established the principle that people should be rewarded in some reasonable, if imperfect, relation to their contribution or product. We also had a considerable sense of purpose. It was never imagined that by merely expelling the British we would automatically achieve paradise. But these early prerequisites of development, vital though they were, are largely ignored today. In drawing on our own experience, we are influenced by the later stage of our development when capital became important.

However, in our political and economic policy, we are much less often the victims of retarded intelligence than of convenient illusion. That is so here. It is doubtful that many of us, if pressed, would insist that economic development was simply a matter of external aid. But nothing could be more convenient than to believe this, for once we admit that it is not the case, we become entrapped in a succession of grievously complex problems.

Thus we would have to consider how a country can greatly increase its literacy rate and at the same time build a system of higher education. To organize a good school system, or reform a bad one, is far harder than to organize an equivalent outlay on dams, turbines, generators and transmission lines. This nevertheless may be the easiest of the barriers to pass. To develop a clear sense of purpose; to get an effective system of public administration when one must build on nothing; and to win social reform when great and perhaps even decisive power is held by those to whom reform would be costly—these are vastly more difficult. So the solution has been to pretend that these problems do not exist and that economic aid will turn the trick.

Present attitudes toward aid have a further consequence; they allow and encourage poor selection of the objects of aid, disperse the limited energies of the aided country, encourage a lack of continuity and preclude any real test of performance. This, to repeat, is not an indictment of aid as such and should not be taken for encouragement by those who are opposed on principle to the golden rule. It is very much an indictment of the present approach to aid.

Specifically, if external resources are assumed to be the limiting factor, any particular infusion of such resources is presumed to help. This means that the particular investment to be aided is not subject to any very rigorous test; it can be decided by bilateral bargaining between the representatives of the United States and those of the recipient country. This bargaining allows an almost incredible variety of irrelevant considerations to enter. Our representatives, governed by the imitative habits of mind just mentioned, assume that what exists in the United States has proven itself by the success of the United States. Therefore there is a strong presumption that it will be good for the aided county. "To the campesino's desire for seed, land and water, the agricultural service has too often responded by offering insecticides, sprayers, fertilizers, and a school for training tractor mechanics. The agricultural service has suffered from being too close a copy of the U.S. Extension Service." [1]

The United States has a great variety of developmental services appropriate both to its high state of development and its ability to finance things of secondary importance. The tendency to duplicate these leads to heavy burdens and a radical dispersal of energies. The particular dispersion will depend on the accident of personalities. The arrival of a specialist in plant-breeding will lead to a new enthusiasm for hybrid corn; a home economist will bear the torch for home economics; someone with a background in adult education will give revitalized leadership to a movement for adult education until he departs for the next country. These tendencies are unlikely to be resisted in the recipient country. Officials of a number of countries have said quite frankly that they do not hesitate to adjust their requests to the preferences or whims of current personnel in the American mission. Money talks. Nor are the insights and preferences of the recipients more acute. These are subject to the desire for monument building and the tendency for a new ministerial personality to decry the work of his predecessor and seek to memorialize his own intuition and magic. One form of aid being about as good as another, there is a strong temptation for the donor country to keep the peace and meet these requests. It helps to support the Government and maintain its friendship.

The result is a measure of incoherence, discontinuity, dispersal of scarce energies and, inevitably, of waste. But—and this point must be emphasized—there is no remedy within the present framework. No one can be fired for selecting the wrong projects as long as all are assured to do some good and no one knows for sure which do the most good. There will be improvement only when we begin seriously to ask what is needed—when targets are established and attention becomes focused on what is required to reach them. Then it will be impossible (or anyhow difficult) to avoid thinking about the missing elements. And once targets are established and effort becomes purposefully directed toward achieving them, we shall have measures of success—or of failure. Then, conspicuous failure will at least have to be explained, and responsibility for a wrong decision assigned. There can surely be no feature of present aid programs that is so unsatisfactory as that by which much aid brings little or no progress and no one gets blamed. Public life was not meant to be that easy.

III

One rather more general observation may help to bring this problem into focus. The underdeveloped countries of South America, Africa and Asia can be thought of as the products—and also the victims—of a great historical discontinuity. Colonialism brought them in each case to a certain stage of development. It supplied capital and, in most cases, did this very well. By its nature it supplied a government and the related elements of administration, and in most instances it provided the rudiments of an educational system. Some part of these, at least, was left behind. But given the goals of colonial rule and its tendency to superimpose a small external elite on the social and economic life of the colony, colonialism rarely left a satisfactory system of social justice. And the resentment and antagonisms it aroused, together with some of the social theory that it often provided, led to a partly heroic and partly romantic view of development which has not ordinarily been consistent with serious purpose.

The task of development has been to pick up where colonialism left off—sometimes, as in the case of many of the Latin American countries, after a long interim period of stagnation. In a few countries, as we have noted, colonialism in its day provided a number of the essentials of development, and there the discontinuity is not total; the requisites for continued advance are present. But in other cases colonialism did not provide even the minimum elements for development. In Haiti, for example, it is unlikely that in terms of per capita income there has been any advance since the French were expelled in 1804; that there has been deterioration is far more probable. In a considerable number of the former Spanish countries, income (and literacy, health and general well-being) cannot be appreciably higher than at the time of independence. The Peruvian Indians are probably worse off than under the Inca. And as the Congo sufficiently emphasizes, a number of the new African states are gaining independence with no more, and possibly fewer, of the requirements for advance than were possessed by the Western Hemisphere colonies of Spain.

It is because we agree that colonialism left some of the countries without the requirements for independent advance that we are providing aid today. But we have not reflected on what is missing. In assuming that capital is the missing element, we are continuing to provide the one thing that colonialism provided. This perpetuates the unviable structure left by colonialism and—not surprisingly—it brings down on our heads some of the discredit and dislike which accrued to the colonial powers.

We are face to face, then, with the disconcerting need for new thinking about economic development. This is embarrassing not alone because it is difficult but also because a reputation for soundness in our day continues to rest on a zealous avoidance of novelty, while no one is so admired for his wisdom as the man who reacts sympathetically to change and then explains why it is unwise. Yet there is no escape. The specifications are clear. We must have a design for economic development which extends to all of the barriers to advance; it must be adaptable to the situation of the individual country; and we must have some objective tests of progress. We can no longer allow ourselves to assume progress where, in fact, there is none. If we are contributing to development, we need to know it and stick to our course. If we are on the wrong path, we also need to know it and change.

Finally, what we do must be reasonably accommodated to the financial and administrative resources of the United States and must be considerate of the sensibilities of the newly emerged countries. Nevertheless, we should be aware that excessive sensibility can serve to protect present barriers to progress and that here, as so often in the economics of the impoverished, choice is inescapable. What to do?

IV

For purposes of designation, we may let a new system of organizing foreign aid be called the positive development plan. The positive features are two: it sets achievable but firm goals for the country seeking development, with provision for measuring progress toward their attainment; and it seeks the removal of all of the barriers to advance in the particular country.

Specifically, the plan envisages a small but talented group of men assembled in Washington under the aegis of a new agency which may be called the National Development Institute. Its purpose, first, is to help countries seeking development under this plan to establish the targets or goals which

[1] Richard W. Patch, "Bolivia and U.S. Assistance," in "Social Change in Latin America Today." New York: Harper (for the Council on Foreign Relations), 1960, p. 163.

they can reasonably hope to achieve over, say, a 7-year period and to devise the steps for achieving these goals; and second, to help the Government, not only to execute the program, but to develop the permanent administration required to achieve these goals and continue on the path of permanent and independent development. Acceptance of the positive development plan and of the assistance provided by the National Development Institute would be voluntary, and failure to do so would not exclude a country from other aid programs. Once accepted, the United States would be committed to support the plan and to pursue it for a specified period. For reasons to be mentioned presently, this does not of itself imply a greater aggregate outlay by the United States.

By way of more detailed illustration, a Central American or newer African state would formally seek the help of the National Development Institute in formulating 7-year targets and the measures for achieving them. A small panel would then be constituted consisting in approximately equal numbers of representatives of the Institute and the recipient country. Working partly in Washington and partly in the recipient country over a period of 6 months, the group would draw up targets, determine the requisite steps and promulgate the plan. American members of the panel would remain in close informal communication with the Institute as a way of sharing and developing experience, of checking the validity of proposals and making the most of scarce personnel resources. Again for purposes of designation, we may call the panel the Planning and Development Authority.

The targets should be both economic and cultural. Four may be sufficient; a specified gain in national income, a specified improvement in its distribution, a specified advance in literacy, and improvement in other areas of education. A multiplication of targets—always a temptation in such planning—must be avoided, and those that are set must be capable of realization. This is subject to a measure of internal control; the targets must be consistent with the measures recommended for reaching them and these, in turn, must be consistent with the measures—external and internal—which will be available.

By establishing targets and agreeing upon the steps to achieve them, all of the barriers to development will be brought into view. Education, social reform, and development of public administration will each command its appropriate share of attention—along with economic investment. In this way attention can be focused on the barriers that inhibit advance in the particular country.

The formulation of a plan of this kind is not a matter of great inherent difficulty. The principal problem is to resist the temptation to be grandiose and to avoid things that belong to far later stages of development. But to carry out even the simplest plan is another matter. If a government itself must be built, who is going to establish an educational system, guide an investment program or carry through social reforms—and by what means? The circle is closed, especially as resistance to indispensable reform and to outside help and advice can be expected. Somehow the country must be helped to get the administrative machinery, leadership, organizing ability, technical and professional knowledge, clarity and consistency of purpose to escape from the self-reinforcing bind of backwardness, and it must be persuaded of its need. In the past, planning missions have offered detailed instructions as to what should be done, and then have left the country with the far more difficult task of execution.

The only possible procedure is for the Planning and Development Authority to remain in the country in charge of development. If the plan is acceptable to the recipient country, the Planning and Development Authority will become, in effect, a Development Ministry. Existing Government agencies which have development responsibilities—in education, industrial development, agriculture, internal revenue—will become subject to its overall directions. This arrangement is indispensable, for it is idle to set targets and not provide the essential machinery for reaching them. Yet no one should disguise the fact that on this point the proposal will encounter its most critical objection. The Planning and Development Authority, led in part by foreigners, will seem an invasion of sovereignty. Nations that have won political freedom at what seems to them great cost and peril will be quick to sense a possible threat to their independence.

However, the fact that our intentions are not imperialistic has considerable, if by no means universal, credence. We are contending not with an intention that must be disguised but with a myth that must be dispelled. The difference is considerable. Then there are certain measures of reassurance which we can provide. In the execution phase of the plan, the chairman of the Planning and Development Authority should be the most competent national of the recipient country. And during the period of development the American members should be gradually withdrawn as trained and competent replacements become available. This is in keeping with the design for progress toward fully independent development. United Nations personnel should be closely associated with the work; perhaps a U.N. observer should be invited to be present. And while there must be a strong presumption that the enterprise will be carried through to the target date, it is revocable. In the end, however, acceptance must depend on the deep desire for effective development. This is strong and may grow stronger as dissatisfaction with present progress increases.

Our own undertaking must also be firm, which means that Congress must accept a fairly long-range commitment to this general design. This will not come easily. However, there are features that should commend themselves to any legislator who is concerned with economy. Under this plan, everything that is spent is purposefully directed to the goal of self-support. Resources will be used in accordance with an organized system of priorities. Tighter administration through the Planning and Development Authority could also be a source of economy.

Finally, there will be targets and, for the first time, a way of measuring the return on outlay. There will be annual reports of progress and detailed explanation of any failure to maintain scheduled advance. Responsibility for failure will be pinpointed. We have here the first requirement for sound economy.

Total cost must not exceed a realistic appraisal of what the United States can be expected to spend. And this amount may set the level of the targets. But given acceptance of the plan, the commitment must be sufficient to achieve targets that will catch the imagination and attract the energies of the country. Acceptance is an indication of serious intent all around.

The plan envisages a close articulation between the Planning and Development Authority and the National Development Institute. The latter would provide personnel from what, it may be hoped, will be a small but highly trained and expert cadre available to the authorities for specialized tasks and subject to prompt reassignment when replacements have been trained or their task otherwise completed. The National Development Institute would also supervise training of nationals in the United States and arrange for procurement in this country. This close articulation would mean that our resources were committed directly to the planning and development authorities so that, without ostensible tying of aid, the adverse effect on the balance of payments would be much smaller than in the case of ordinary dollar aid.

Under the positive development plan, it is important that funds be available for those measures of social refrom no less urgent than education or capital investment. As noted, feudal institutions are as great a barrier to advance as illiteracy and capital shortage, and in the long run they are probably more important. Land reform under the aegis of the planning and development authority helps assure, to some degree, its practicability, for it avoids the obstacle that landlords are either unwilling to entrust their fate to arbitrary valuation procedures and uncertain compensation, or they assume charge of the operation themselves which insures that planning never gives way to action. The planning and development authority provides the hope that land reform can be done equitably, and hence that it will be done.

V

Commonly in the underdeveloped country two powerful political forces are in opposition. On the one hand, there is the drive for modernization and advancing real income; on the other, there is vested interest in backwardness which, in practical manifestation, is usually a system of great landlords and landless tenants. The first thrust is by no means weak in relation to the second. The political strategy of development is to capitalize on it to overcome the vested resistance of the second, and to guide it into channels of orderly change. Perhaps the most serious indictment of present attitudes toward development is that we have failed utterly to find a formula for obviating this potential clash. Then, when it occurs, as in Cuba, we can react only with distraught surprise.

No country should be forced or even persuaded to enter the positive development plan. Failure to do so would not prejudice access to other forms of aid. It might be desirable if the first response were modest—one or two Caribbean or Central American countries, a newer African state—so that the initial experience might be on something of a pilot scale. Moreover, it should be made clear from the outset that there are some underdeveloped countries—such as India, Pakistan, or Mexico—to which the positive development plan is not applicable. These countries do not use their aid perfectly, but unlike others, they have a positive approach to the problem of development, or (as in the case of Mexico) they have broken through the main barriers to advance.

Objections to this plan will not be difficult to discover, and it is assuredly open to modification and amendment. But the ability to discover deficiencies in a proposal involving social innovation is not—in the absence of suggested alternatives—the most challenging test to which the social scientist or public official can address himself. Nor is the ability to identify reasons why something should not be done the quality which the American people sought most in the administration they brought into office last autumn. Above all, it must be borne in mind that the present procedures on foreign aid in a very large number of countries are acceptable only because we have so resolutely avoided measuring the results.

ERRORS IN THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

(By Mr. Justice Douglas)

I have long admired the close affiliation between Mount Holyoke and the Women's Christian College of Madras, India. While Mount Holyoke alumnae have mostly provided funds and facilities for this Indian college, they have also provided a few professors for work overseas. I hope in the

years ahead that the bonds between the two institutions will become closer that there will indeed be a circulating faculty giving needed instruction abroad in Western ideology, and fertilizing the campus of Mount Holyoke with seeds of Eastern thought. Only in such ways can we build a true intellectual nexus between leaders of Eastern thought and exponents of Western traditions.

Mount Holyoke-in-India—like Yale-in-China—is an important symbol of our effort in the ideological struggle that sweeps the world. We need many, many more outposts of that character if we are to win the contest.

We have been possessed with the idea that if we fill underdeveloped nations with refrigerators, bathtubs, and tractors the battle against communism will somehow be won. The results have been tragic. Our bathtubs have been used in Asia's villages to store grain. The men and women who can read the manual that goes with tractors and refrigerators can also read the Communist Manifesto. As a matter of fact, there is nothing ideological about tractors, refrigerators, and bathtubs. Russia makes them as well as we do. There is nothing ideological about the Industrial Revolution. Russia has used it for her purposes as well as we have for our purposes.

The difference in the two groups that contend for the hearts and minds of people across the world is in the spiritual, not in the material, world. The great advantage is ours, if we will exploit it. The advantage is in the principles and ideals of our democratic society. Yet we have so neglected this vital difference between freedom and communism, that our foreign officers who are briefed for duty abroad are never briefed on the Bill of Rights.

Since World War II, the United States has not been greatly concerned with the political education of the men and women who will lead the new nations emerging from colonialism. We have of course opened our colleges and universities to many foreign students.

In the academic year 1960–61 about 50,000 foreign students came here to study. Some were in primary and secondary schools. Many were in our colleges and universities. But little effort was made to establish courses in political education that embraced Western philosophy, theories and forms of democratic government, separation of powers, curbing of majorities, bills of right, protection of minorities, and the like. Many foreign students are exposed to these problems and the literature of our free society. Yet the process has been largely hit-or-miss. We never really undertook a comprehensive program of indoctrination that was at all competitive with what the Communists undertake both at Moscow and at Prague.

We can do much here. But the educational projects needed in these underdeveloped nations are so immense that the main training centers must of necessity be located in the various underdeveloped countries. The cost of doing it there will be so much lower that cost alone will be a principal determinative factor. Moreover, unless students from these areas are chosen with utmost care and meticulous arrangements made for them at this end, a high percentage will go home thinking of America as a callous place. Discrimination on the basis of color is one factor, though it is not the only one. A bewildered African in our highly impersonal metropolitan areas is apt to be bruised and sorely disturbed—and perhaps end up a Communist.

Since World War II we were fighting communism abroad with planes, bombs, guns, and dollars. The billions we sent abroad to Asia, the Middle East, and Africa did not build schools or hospitals but only military bases, army barracks, and a few factories. The underdeveloped nations that received our aid are mostly worse off for it. It launched them on military projects that gave them such an amount of armament that they crushed all dissident elements. The result was the liquidation of democratic influences and the entrenchment of feudal overlords. Even point 4 helped largely the landlords, not the sharecroppers. The latter are as miserable today as they were when we started our lavish aid programs; only the upper strata has prospered. They became rich on American aid, while the people at the bottom starved. There have been exceptions; but they are unusual. The main impact of American foreign aid was to widen the gulf between rich and poor, helping to create the vacuum into which the Communists easily move.

One reason why we did these foolish and wasteful things was because the Pentagon with its 40 billions a year dominated our thinking. Another reason was that we really never believed in the independence of nations under colonial regimes. Since World War II we vigorously opposed independence. Not once did we either advocate that a people acquire their independence or vote for independence when the issue was presented in the United Nations. The closest we ever came to espousing a cause of independence was when we abstained from voting against independence. Not until March 15, 1961, did we support a subject people against a colonial power. On that day we joined Russia in voting on the side of the people of Angola. Up to then we had so far forsaken the principles of our Declaration of Independence that the people of the world were beginning to think it was a Soviet document. Yet when have the Communists ever liberated a people?

Our preoccupation with military solutions of the problem of underdeveloped nations and with the maintenance of the status quo caused us to lose out in the constitution-making period through which these young nations have passed. There were very few American constitutional experts designing charters for the new nations.

The American design, however, with its separation of powers would have been more durable and practical than the Westminster model which the British passed on to people utterly inexperienced in self-government.

While we mostly missed out on the drafting of the new constitutions, we must not miss out on the vast programs of political education that are now necessary if these young nations are to have the trained, dedicated leadership for the troubled decades that lie ahead. We need teachers by the thousands to go to all these new areas. The need is not only for this year and next; it is a continuing one. As of the academic year 1960–61, there were only four Nigerians qualified to teach at the college level; in Libya there were none.

In February of this year I was in Baghdad giving lectures on the American constitutional system. The College of Law is a lively, bustling place. Kassim's 1958 revolution liberated women on a vast scale. A quarter of the law students are women. Ideas of liberty under law are vivid influences on that campus. Yet when I surveyed the law library I found no books that would give the beginner any idea of even the rudiments of the American constitutional system.

We spent hundreds of millions on the Baghdad Pact (which Kassim promptly repudiated) but nothing on John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison. Yet how can we expect a people who have never experienced a free society to be able to construct one without help and guidance?

Whom are we preparing to go to Kenya or Libya or Nigeria when the new schools are opened and stay 5 years or 10? Whom are we preparing to help staff the nine law schools in Indonesia, the new universities in Malaya, the old ones in Rangoon and in Calcutta? We do not want to send our misfits—those who have not made the grade at home. We need men and women of high caliber.

We do not want them all to go as members of a federal bureaucracy. We need them as teachers representing private groups who can live the lives they choose, be wedded to no political program, and show by words and deeds the warm heart and bright conscience of America.

The problem of mobilizing them is not an easy one. Those who disappear for 5 years in a faraway country may lose out in the competition at home. What inducements can we offer?

One solution is for each American school to make a foreign one its affiliate. If an American school selects an old or new one in Asia, Africa, or South America, it can assign two or three or four of its faculty for work abroad. Those who work abroad will have the same fringe benefits that those on the American campus enjoy. The faculty abroad will indeed be a floating or changing one.

Once American schools see this challenge, they will meet it. We need the example of Mount Holyoke-in-India and Yale-in-China multiplied a thousandfold with American colleges and universities, working at the level of legal, constitutional, and political education in the underdeveloped nations. This means the export of thousands of American teachers. They will over the years supply the ferment necessary to produce in these blighted areas viable democratic societies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 13, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

Samuel D. Berger, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Anthony B. Akers, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Erle Cocke, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1964, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1964, and until her successor has been appointed and qualified.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Gen. Thomas D. White 22A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be

placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 2 years, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. ARMY

1. The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris O18518, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Van Hugo Bond O18601, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Allan Hansen O18767, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright O18129, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Frank Ruggles O18596, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler O18715, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach O18747, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Louis Watson Truman O18755, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Teddy Hollis Sanford O29893, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Nathan Jay Roberts O24345, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

2. The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Thomas Honeycutt O18975, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Alexander Cunningham 3d, O19579, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Donald Graham, O20067, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, U.S. Army.

Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Dudley Cole, O19749, U.S. Army.

Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, U.S. Army.

Col. Cornelius DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, U.S. Army.

Col. Nathan Jay Roberts, O24345, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham O21073, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Floyd Elmer Fellenz O19485, U.S. Army.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert R. Carper, to be first lieutenant in the Army, and ending John G. Zerby, Jr., to be second lieutenant in the Army, which nominations were received by the Senate on May 23, 1961.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Julian R. Abernathy, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel in the Air Force, and ending Minot K. Schuman, to be first lieutenant in the Air Force, which nominations were received by the Senate on May 22, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 12: 24: *Only fear the Lord, and serve Him in truth with all your heart; for consider what great things He hath done for you.*

Our Heavenly Father, always and everywhere we need Thee; in our perplexities to counsel us, in our sorrows to comfort us, in our strength to discipline us, and in our weakness to sustain us.

Emancipate our souls from the errors and faults that blind and the doubts and fears which assail us as we endeavor to gain a clear vision of those ideals which call and challenge us to a life of honor and service.

Grant that our beloved Speaker and the Members of Congress may be inspired to discharge the duties of each new day with vigor, accepting them with faith and the assurance that there is a divine purpose which we can help to fulfill by committing our abilities and capabilities to the utmost.

Evoke within us a greater devotion to the moral and spiritual values and may we translate them into nobility of character, social justice, national righteousness, and world peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 8, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Bass, N.H.	Hays	Passman
Becker	Holtzman	Powell
Boland	Hosmer	Rabaut
Bolling	Ikard, Tex.	Reece
Boykin	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Johnson, Md.	Roberts
Cahill	Keogh	Rooney
Carey	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Cederberg	Kilgore	St. George
Celler	Landrum	St. Germain
Chelf	Lankford	Scherer
Clancy	Lennon	Sibal
Coad	Lesinski	Smith, Calif.
Cook	McSween	Stafford
Cooley	Macdonald	Staggers
Corbett	Madden	Steed
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Delaney	Mason	Utt
Derwinski	Michel	Vanik
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Van Pelt
Fino	Moorehead, Ohio	Wallhauser
Flynt	Moorhead, Pa.	Walter
Frelinghuysen	Morse	Watts
Giaimo	Moulder	Weis
Gilbert	Murray	Whitener
Glenn	O'Brien, N.Y.	Williams
Grant	O'Konski	Willis
Green, Oreg.	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Hall	Osmers	
Halpern		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] kindly take the chair?

(Mr. HALLECK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. With great personal satisfaction and pleasure I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 333

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby extends its heartiest congratulation to its beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who, today, has served in the high office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for 16 years, 273 days—more than twice as long as any other Speaker in the history of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its deep appreciation to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his impartiality, integrity, and outstanding parliamentary skill in presiding over this House; for enhancing the dignity and traditions of the Speakership; and for his continuing devotion to legislative duty in this House for more than 48 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have just offered speaks for itself, but to stop with the provisions of