growth and mobility, but the cities of our Nation have suffered their increasing blows for decades.

Every day the United States becomes more urban, less rural. Only a half century ago a majority of American families still lived on farms or in rural areas. Today four-fifths of all American families live in cities or in the suburbs which surround them. By 1975, only 15 years away, our explosive population will sweep 55 million additional people into metropolitan areas and 50 million into existing or newly created suburbs. If the population growth nationally has been a strain on all our school systems, think of what it is doing to the urban areas which have had to absorb much of our population gains.

At the suburban town hall and at the city hall local officials have unhappily watched tax rates spiral upward. Suburban towns need suddenly to supply all the services that cities developed over many years. The requirements of an ever-increasing number of families for schools, roads, water supply, waste disposal and protection is forcing suburban finances to their limit. Suburban schools in many areas are new but overcrowded; double shifts are common and programs for the exceptional and handicapped are lacking. In the central city, schools are often antiquated and lacking in play space and athletic facilities and are unable to provide a balanced and complete school program.

My friends, I feel we are repeating in our Federal legislation the very same mistake that is still being perpetrated in our States: We are building into the Federal program a provision which penalizes the large urban areas for the benefit of rural sections. "Equalization plans" as stated in an NEA memo of February 1961, "have recognized the hardships created by sparsity of population but not those created by density of population. The big cities, because of their former greater relative resources, have tended to develop better serviced schools and higher paid staffs than we find elsewhere. But now they are in severe financial straits to maintain former services. Further advances are often held to an inadequate minimum."

The NEA memo concludes: "In a decade when the largest cities have declined in relative population growth and economic strength, the burden of school support has been growing. The loss of high income families to the suburbs and the influx of the low income families into the central cities have created school problems of crisis proportions, and heavier tax levies on the central urban population. Greater help from State government and support from the Federal Government all seem to be needed if additional progress is to be maintained."

I seriously question whether our urban areas are going to obtain this "new support from the Federal Government" through the legislation now pending in the Congress.

We must remember our purpose when we first sought Federal school support. We must help children—not States. It is not necessarily true that a child in a high per capita income State is better off than one in a poor State. Density of youth population, rate of population growth, and the effects of population mobility all must be considered or we may end up pouring millions into open fields while scattering a few bills to the thickening crowds.

What is done in our classrooms today will determine the success or failure of our civilization tomorrow. The foundations for a national educational program will be set within the next month. I am confident that with your continued interest and your efforts we will build a sound structure to meet the rapid changes coming in tomorrow's world.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 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:

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years Thy goodness faileth never. Away from all the divisive forces of the world in which our lot is cast, forces which tear, and separate, and push apart, we would bow in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us forth on our differing and often difficult task, hoping all things and enduring all things.

We pray that Thou wilt enable, with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might, those who in these fearful times in the ministry of public affairs have been entrusted with the stewardship of the national life.

Grant unto us that greatness of spirit which shall match the stupendous patterns of this creative day. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and selfish expediency.

O Thou God to whose kingdom the future belongs, use us in our loyalty to America at its best, as pioneers of a better habitation for humanity, both for ourselves and for all the peoples of the earth.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 16, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 16, 1961, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 133. An act giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between these States;

S. 215. An act for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren;

S. 546. An act for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung;

S. 751. An act to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 949. An act for the relief of John G. Tiedermann;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Samuel Pisar;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild Variety Artists Week.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1619) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 75. An act to amend section 2103 of title 28, United States Code, relating to appeals improvidently taken;

H.R. 1935. An act to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes;

H.R. 2249. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in the State of California to the county of Trinity;

H.R. 2250. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.;

H.R. 2730. An act to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 1 ;, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 3385. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of electron microscopes and certain other apparatus imported by, or on behalf of, certain institutions;

H.R. 6269. An act to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date;

H.R. 6835. An act to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements;

H.R. 7099. An act to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas;

H.R. 7148. An act to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of vet-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

erans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial;

H.R. 7189. An act granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States; and

H.R. 7712. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 2972. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales; and

H.R. 7218. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 75. An act to amend section 2103 of title 28, United States Code, relating to appeals improvidently taken;

H.R. 2730. An act to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 6835. An act to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements;

H.R. 7099. An act to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas; and

H.R. 7189. An act granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1935. An act to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2249. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in the State of California to the county of Trinity; and

H.R. 2250. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 3385. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free entry of electron microscopes and certain other apparatus imported by, or on behalf of, certain institutions;

H.R. 6269. An act to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date; and

H.R. 7148. An act to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 7712. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, and Welfare, of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF JAPAN ON JUNE 22

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Thursday, June 22, 1961, to declare a recess, for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of Japan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me ask the majority leader whether he knows at what time the Prime Minister will come to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as we can ascertain, it is anticipated that he will be here at about 2:50 or 3 o'clock.

I express the hope, and I know the minority leader joins me in it, that there will be a good attendance in the Senate on that auspicious occasion.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DISSOLUTION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to dissolve Federal Facilities Corporation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 416(b)(1) OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 416(b)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 109 OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the general supply fund (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas the U.S. Government is presently indebted in an approximate sum of $295 billion and the debt increases each year; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government now pays approximately $9 billion in interest on the present indebtedness each fiscal year; and

"Whereas the value of a dollar continues to decrease, particularly since World War II, largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the people of the United States are already bearing a practically confiscatory and excessive burden of taxes, particularly from the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the State of Texas hereby urges and memorializes the Congress of the United States to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as provided by article V of the Constitution, to read as follows, to wit:

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimate of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of the receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimate of the receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until such action has been taken

as may be necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress;' and, be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to each congressional representative from the State.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"President of the Senate.
"JAMES A. TURMAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"DOROTHY HALLMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"CHARLES SCHNABEL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Resolutions adopted by the Pennsylvania Department of Veteran Affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Farrell, Pa., relating to the purchasing power of the dollar, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin relating to compulsory medical care; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Baltic States Joint Committee of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., pledging their support of the President and the Congress in establishing peace throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Bountiful, Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to expedite the planning and construction of power transmission lines of the Colorado River storage project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Montgomery County, For America, Royersford, Pa., expressing concern about States' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Henry Stoner, a citizen of the State of Florida, relating to the power of the Government to maintain a republican form of government in each State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Ft. Lauderdale and Greater Hollywood Chambers of Commerce, both of the State of Florida, relating to the enactment by the Legislature of Florida of a redistricting bill, and requesting its veto by the Governor of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Texas Surveyors Association, at Washington, D.C., remonstrating against the legality of the secondary boycott; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., expressing thanks to the Congress for help given to make the scouting program effective in the life of the Nation; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that H. 1603, "memorializing Congress with respect to amending the internal revenue laws so that the personal exemption on the income tax of individuals may be increased," which was recently passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, be inserted in the RECORD, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

(H. 1603)

Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to amending the internal revenue laws so that the personal exemption on the income tax of individuals may be increased

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to make such amendment to the internal revenue laws so that the personal exemption on the income tax of individuals be increased from $600 to $800; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable action taken by Congress on this important matter.

RESOLUTION OF GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Group Health Association of America, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., urging the enactment of certain pending legislation before the Congress.

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

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas to make the benefits of modern medicine available to all Americans requires, in addition to better arrangements in the financing of health care, a substantial increase in the number of professional health personnel, and a significant expansion of community health facilities and services; and

Whereas Federal action is urgently required to bring about these critically needed improvements, since:

1. Existing sources of financial support cannot meet the costs of a construction, expansion, and scholarship program adequate to the Nation's need for more physicians and other health personnel, and

2. Local communities need Federal financial aid to develop better services for the aged and chronically ill, such as organized home care, and other services not now widely available, and

3. The improvement of the abysmal state of currently available nursing home care requires an increase in the funds available through the Hill-Burton program for the construction of high quality nonprofit nursing homes, and

4. The combination of comprehensive prepayment with the group practice of medicine holds great promise for making high quality care more readily available, but the difficulty of financing needed facilities has been a major obstacle in the further development and expansion of such plans; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to provide for effective Federal action toward these ends: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Group Health Association of America convey to the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and other Members of Congress the unanimous belief of its members and affiliates that favorable action is urgently required this year on the following three legislative proposals:

1. S. 1072 and H.R. 4999, Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, to provide grants to medical and dental schools for construction, expansion, cost of education, and for scholarships to gifted students in health professions who are in need of Federal assistance, and

2. S. 1071 and H.R. 4998, the Community Health Services and Facilities Act, to provide funds for the construction of nursing homes; grants to State and local governments, and voluntary agencies and institutions to stimulate the development, improvement, and expansion of health services, particularly for the aged and chronically ill; and to provide funds for research and demonstration in the utilization and provision of hospital services, and

3. S. 1158 and H.R. 5887, the Health Services Facilities Act, to provide long-term, low-interest loans to comprehensive medical care plans for financing of necessary facilities.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION EXCISE TAX—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade has adopted a resolution favoring the repeal of the Federal transportation excise tax. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION URGING REPEAL OF FEDERAL PASSENGER TAX

Whereas on April 4, 1960, the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade presented a resolution requesting the immediate and complete repeal of the wartime excise tax of 10 percent on passenger transportation; and

Whereas the plight of the rail lines, buslines and airlines has steadily worsened, the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade repeats its urgent appeal for speedy action to eliminate this unreasonable burden; and

Whereas the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade is vitally interested in the preservation of all transportation systems servicing the port of New York; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on passenger transportation in the United States imposes an excessive and unnecessary burden upon all who travel in the pursuit of business vital to the national economy and welfare; and

Whereas this levy, imposed as an emergency wartime measure nearly 20 years ago to discourage nonessential use of an overtaxed transportation system, has long since ceased to serve any part or semblance of its original purpose; and

Whereas the similar wartime excise tax on the transportation of goods was repealed in 1958; and

Whereas this unnecessary and inequitable excise tax, by adding to the cost of travel and thereby discouraging use of transportation, poses an immediate and serious threat

to common carrier services essential to the health and well-being of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade does support the railroads, the airlines and the buslines in their earnest request for the needful elimination of the 10 percent Federal transportation excise tax immediately and in its entirety, as this is in the public interest and essential to the national economy and places the board on record as favoring that repeal; and

Whereas this immediate and complete repeal is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the position of the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade favoring the repeal of this tax be made known to the Congress, and that the Congress be urgently petitioned to take immediate corrective legislative action.

H. E. SHIPLEY,
Chairman, Transportation Section, New York Board of Trade.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 6027. An act to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 425).

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

S. 901. A bill to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys, to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and laboratory facilities, to expedite oceanographic instrumentation, to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments, to enhance the public health and general welfare, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 426).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.R. 7712. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 427).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3283. An act to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 429);

H.R. 5416. An act to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 430);

H.R. 5475. An act to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 431);

H.R. 5760. An act to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 432); and

H.R. 5765. An act to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways (Rept. No. 433).

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

S. 857. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park (Rept. No. 428).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 6422. An act to add federally owned lands to, and exclude federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 434).

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 614. A bill to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 435).

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2113. 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 (Rept. No. 436).

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 146. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children (Rept. No. 437).

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

S. 2051. A bill to afford children of certain deceased veterans who were eligible for the benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 but who, because of residence in the Republic of the Philippines, were unable to receive such assistance prior to enactment of Public Law 85-460, additional time to complete their education (Rept. No. 438).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2096. A bill for the relief of Ding Lam Tam and Ding Yun Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2097. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2098. A bill to govern the harvesting of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Tina Jane Beland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2100. A bill to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2102. A bill to redesignate the Jefferson division of the eastern district of Texas as the Marshall division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2103. A bill to provide for planning the participation of the United States in the New York World's Fair, to be held at New York City in 1964 and 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 2104. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to permit patent holders to bring civil actions against Government contractors who infringe their patents while carrying out Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2105. A bill for the relief of Evert G. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Lee Fong Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2107. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity;

S. 2108. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide for summary judgment procedure in appropriate cases in the consideration of license applications; and

S. 2109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2110. A bill to provide for a memorial to the memory of the late Senator George W. Norris, at McCook, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2111. A bill to change the penalty for violation of section 4(e) to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act relating to the promotion of safety of life and property on islands and structures built upon submerged lands, and for other purposes; and

S. 2112. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create trial boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 2113. 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. HARTKE:

S. 2114. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint two individuals as referees of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2115. A bill to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass.; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN STAINED GLASS WINDOWS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to relieve St. Joseph's Cathedral of Hartford, Conn., from the payment of a duty on the importation of its stained glass windows.

I would like to briefly state the history behind the introduction of this bill.

The tariff law exempts from the payment of duty various kinds of stained glass windows which are judged to be works of art. Such an exemption was applied for in the case of the stained glass in question and was denied by the Treasury Department on the ground that these windows, composed of thick pieces of colored glass laid over an artistically created window design, chipped so as to facet the glass and cemented together, are not stained glass windows within the scope of paragraph 810 of the Tariff Act.

The Treasury Department had made a similar ruling on an identical case last year with respect to the Mission of San Gabriel, in California. The Mission of San Gabriel appealed the Treasury Department's ruling before the customs court of Los Angeles and won its appeal, thus establishing legal precedent on the side of the position taken by St. Joseph's Cathedral.

The Treasury Department, however, though it did not choose to appeal the court decision, did not accept it as a basis for changing its ruling.

There is a legislative as well as a court precedent in favor of the action proposed in this bill. Public Law 1001, enacted on August 6, 1956, granted a similar relief to the First Presbyterian Church of Stamford, Stamford, Conn., despite the opposition of the Treasury Department.

Identical legislation to that which I now introduce has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of the First Congressional District of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2100) to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn., introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REDESIGNATION OF JEFFERSON DIVISION OF EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AS THE MARSHALL DIVISION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to redesignate the Jefferson division of the eastern district of Texas as the Marshall division. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2102) to redesignate the Jefferson division of the eastern district of Texas as the Marshall division, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 124(c)(5) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The Marshall Division comprises the counties of Camp, Cass, Harrison, Hopkins, Marion, Morris, and Upshur.

"Court for the Marshall Division shall be held at Marshall."

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make possible U.S. participation in the New York World's Fair.

Several New York Representatives are introducing similar bills today in the other body; the proposed legislation was drafted by the Department of Commerce to implement Commerce Secretary Hodges' recommendation that the Federal Government should participate fully in the World's Fair. The bill authorizes the President to investigate and make recommendations to Congress for U.S. participation in the fair and to designate an agency and to appoint a U.S. Commissioner to carry out such preliminary work as is necessary.

The extraordinary planning that is now underway for the New York World's Fair of 1964 and 1965 makes it clear that this will be an historic milestone of our Nation of vast benefit, direct and indirect, to the United States and the world. The theme of the fair is "Man's Achievement on a Shrinking Globe in an Expanding Universe." Its main objective is "Peace Through Understanding." Its purpose is predominantly educational.

President Kennedy has given the New York World's Fair his complete support as did President Eisenhower before him. The three living ex-Presidents of the United States are honorary chairmen. Outstanding leaders in American life comprise the board of directors. And the Nation's great No. 1 city planner and master builder, Robert Moses, is president of the fair.

My colleague and I hope Congress will approve this legislation promptly to pave the way for U.S. participation in this truly historic American event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2103) to provide for planning the participation of the United States in the New York World's Fair, to be held at New York City in 1964 and 1965, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted today to join with my senior colleague [Mr. JAVITS] in support of a bill to authorize a full study of Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1964–65. As a member of the board of directors of the fair, with my colleague, I have been watching with great interest the development of this exciting international project to promote and enhance peace through understanding. I am happy that the New York delegation in the other body is today introducing the same legislation which we offer here in the Senate. This bill is identical to proposed legislation sent to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges.

This is an historic moment for the World's Fair. An administration backed bill authorizing Federal participation will go a long way toward expanding the number of exhibits at the fair and increasing interest in it. Already, there are some 42 committed governmental exhibits including the Organization of American States.

The World's Fair is a symbol to all nations of the progress of man. In a way, nothing could be more fitting to express man's achievements than to have the 1964–65 World's Fair located on the former site of a dump on Long Island. Certainly, this is a symbol of man's constant endeavor to improve his environment.

The old Corona dump at Flushing Meadow which was leveled for the 1939–40 World's Fair was made famous in the novel by F. Scott Fitzgerald, "The Great Gatsby." Fitzgerald described the site of the 1939–40 World's Fair and the site to be of the 1964–65 World's Fair as a valley of ashes—a fantastic farm where ashes grow like wheat into ridges and hills and grotesque gardens.

Today, we are taking one more step in revitalizing this now important park in Flushing Meadows, N.Y. The Federal pavilion of the 1964–65 fair will, I am certain, be a shining symbol of man's achievements both on the earth and in space, which in this decade of the 1960's is the real new frontier, the real challenge to man's insatiable urge to conquer new worlds.

APPLICATION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO MILITARY SERVICES TO THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a comparative type showing changes in existing law by the proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2107) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparison, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the laws relating to the Coast Guard in four particulars to make them uniform with similar provisions applicable to the other Armed Forces. An explanation of the four changes is set forth in the following discussion.

The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force possess authority at the present time to remit or cancel any part of an enlisted member's indebtedness to the United States at the time of his honorable discharge if they consider such remission or cancellation in the best interests of the United States (10 U.S.C. 4837(d), 6161, 9837(d)). The Coast Guard is thus the only branch of the Armed Forces without such remission or cancellation authority. In order to provide uniformity in that regard, the proposed bill would grant the Coast Guard the same authority already possessed by the other branches of the Armed Forces.

Prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, enlisted members of the Army and Navy who had been awarded certain medals, such as the Medal of Honor or the Distinguished Service Medal, were entitled to additional pay at the rate of $2 per month (10 U.S.C., 1946 ed., 696; 34 U.S.C., 1946 ed., 357, 364b). These provisions for additional pay were repealed in 1949 by section 531(b)(20), (22), and (23) of the Career Compensation Act (63 Stat. 838). However, similar authority with respect to enlisted members of the Coast Guard was inadvertently not repealed at that time due to the fact that the enactment of both the codification of title 14 containing the provision and the enactment of the Career Compensation Act occurred within a relatively short period of time. Thus, enlisted members of the Coast Guard appear to be at least technically entitled to such additional pay. The proposed bill would correct this situation by specifically repealing the Coast Guard authority in the matter.

With respect to the time limit on the award of medals, existing law applicable to the Navy Department provides that a recommendation for a medal must be made by a superior officer within 3 years of the act justifying the award (10 U.S.C. 6248). A comparable provision applicable to the Coast Guard provides for a limit of 1 year, which has proven too short (14 U.S.C. 496). Also, a provision was recently added to the Navy Department authority to cover a situation where a recommendation for a medal was lost or not acted on through inadvertence (Public Law 86-582; 74 Stat. 320). No comparable provision exists with respect to the Coast Guard. The proposed bill would make the Coast Guard authority in regard to the award of medals conform to that of the Navy Department.

Under existing law, firearms, and ammunition bought with funds appropriated for a military department are exempt from sales or transfer taxes (10 U.S.C. 2385). No similar exemption is provided for the Coast Guard and it expends approximately $6,400 per annum in payment of such taxes. Inasmuch as the Coast Guard is by statute a branch of the Armed Forces (14 U.S.C. 1), there would appear to be no justification for this discriminatory treatment and the proposed bill would grant the Coast Guard the same exemption presently accorded the military departments.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW BY THE PROPOSED BILL

(Matter proposed to be omitted enclosed in black brackets; new matter in italic)

SECTION 461, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (1958 EDITION)

§ 461. Pay and allowances; pay of officers indebted to *the* United States[.] *; remission of indebtedness of enlisted members.*

(a) Commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, cadets, warrant officers, and enlisted persons shall, except as otherwise provided by law, receive the same pay, allowances, increases, additions, and gratuities as prescribed by corresponding ranks, grades, or ratings for personnel of the Navy, including any extra pay and allowances for special duty.

(b) The pay of officers of the Coast Guard may be withheld under section 82 of title 5 on account of an indebtedness to the United States admitted or shown by the judgment of a court, but not otherwise unless upon a special order issued according to the discretion of the Secretary.

(c) *If he considers it in the best interest of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury may have remitted or canceled any part of an enlisted member's indebtedness to the United States or any of its instrumentalities remaining unpaid before, or at the time of, that member's honorable discharge.*

ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 13, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (1958 EDITION)

§ 461. Pay and allowances; pay of officers indebted to the United States[.] *; remission of indebtedness of enlisted members.*

SECTION 495, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (1958 EDITION)

[§ 495. Additional pay for holders of medals.

[Each enlisted man in the Coast Guard who is awarded a medal of honor, a distinguished service medal, or a Coast Guard medal shall be entitled to additional pay at the rate of $2 per month from the date of the deed or service for which the award is made, and each emblem or insignia in lieu of a medal of honor, a distinguished service medal, or a Coast Guard medal shall entitle him to further additional pay at the rate of $2 per month from the date of the deed or service for which such award is made, and such additional pay shall continue throughout his active service, whether such service shall or shall not be continuous.]

ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 13, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (1958 EDITION)

[495. Additional pay for holders of medals.]

SECTION 496, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (1958 EDITION)

§ 496. Time limit on award; report concerning deed.

(a) No medal of honor, distinguished service medal, *distinguished flying cross,* Coast Guard medal, *or bar,* [or] emblem, or insignia in lieu thereof [shall be issued to any person after more than five years from the date of the deed or service justifying the awarding thereof, nor unless a specific statement or report distinctly setting forth the deed or service and suggesting or recommending official recognition thereof shall have been made by his superior through official channels at the time of the deed or service or within one year after the deed or termination of the service.] *may be awarded to a person unless—*

(1) the award is made within five years after the date of the deed or service justifying the award;

(2) a statement setting forth the deed or distinguished service and recommending official recognition of it was made by his superior through official channels within three years from the date of that deed or termination of the service.

(b) If the Secretary determines that—

(1) a statement setting forth the deed or distinguished service and recommending official recognition of it was made by the person's superior through official channels within three years from the date of that deed or termination of the service and was supported by sufficient evidence within that time; and

(2) no award was made, because the statement was lost or through inadvertence the recommendation was not acted upon; a medal of honor, distinguished service medal, distinguished flying cross, Coast Guard medal, or bar, emblem, or insignia in lieu thereof, as the case may be, may be awarded to the person within two years after the date of that determination.

SECTION 655, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE (PROPOSED NEW SECTION)

§ 655. Arms and ammunition; immunity from taxation.

No tax on the sale or transfer of firearms, pistols, revolvers, shells, or cartridges may be imposed on such articles when bought with funds appropriated for the United States Coast Guard.

ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 17, TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

655. Arms and ammunition; immunity from taxation.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT PROCEDURE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide for summary judgment procedure in appropriate cases in the consideration of license applications. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a justification therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the letter and justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2108) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide for summary judgment procedure in appropriate cases in the consideration of license applications, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and justification, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress a proposal to amend the Communications Act to provide for summary judgment procedure in the consideration of license applications, in appropriate cases.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,
NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO PROVIDE THAT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION MAY ACT UPON LICENSE APPLICATIONS UNDER A SUMMARY PROCEDURE AFTER ACCORDING PARTIES AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD

The Commission's legislative proposal would amend sections 309(d)(2) and 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 309), so as to permit the Commission, when it was unable to find that a grant would be in the public interest, to consider and determine its action on license applications after according applicants and parties in interest an opportunity to be heard, but without resort to full evidentiary hearings where no genuine, substantial, and material issues of fact have been presented.

This procedure would afford applicants and parties in interest an ample opportunity to be heard and at the same time it would serve to sharply reduce the number of protracted evidentiary hearings. In cases where the Commission finds after examination of the application and pleadings that there is no real dispute on any substantial fact that would be material to the Commission's decision, there would be no need to hold a full evidentiary hearing. The participants would be afforded the opportunity to address themselves to the questions before the Commission by the filing of additional pleadings and oral argument, thus giving the Commission their views before it reaches its ultimate decision on the matter. This procedure would not, of course, affect the Commission's present authority to dismiss, without evidentiary hearing or oral argument, any application which is not in accordance with the Commission's published rules and regulations.

Section 309(d)(2) now provides that where the Commission finds that there are no substantial or material questions of fact and that a grant of an application would be consistent with the public interest, it may make such grant, issuing a statement of the reasons therefor. This subsection, together with subsection 309(e), also provides that if a substantial and material question of fact is presented, the Commission shall designate the application for a full hearing in which the applicant and all other parties in interest shall be permitted to participate and introduce evidence. This approach accords with the generally accepted proposition of administrative law that questions concerning adjudicative facts—facts about the parties, their activities, businesses, and properties which are material to a decision—are best determined on the basis of a record made in an evidentiary hearing.

Section 309(e) of the present statute goes, however, much further than this. It provides in so many words for what is seemingly the same kind of hearing if the Commission for any reason is unable to find that a grant of an application would be consistent with the public interest. In the words of the Supreme Court in *U.S.* v. *Storer Broadcasting Co.*, 351 U.S. 192, 202, "a full hearing under section 309 means that every party shall have the right to present his case or defense by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of facts."

Where there are no genuine and substantial issues of fact, the resolution of which is material to the ultimate decision, the language of section 309(e) with its apparent requirement for an evidentiary hearing in any case involving a denial of an application, seems to misconceive the very purpose of this kind of hearing and goes beyond the requirements of due process. As was said by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in *Producers Livestock Marketing Association* v. *U.S.*, 241 F. 2d, 192, 196 (1957), aff'd. 356 U.S. 272, "It is fundamental to the law that the submission of evidence is not required to characterize 'a full hearing' where such evidence is immaterial to the issue to be decided. Where no genuine or material issue of fact is presented, the court or administrative body may pass upon the issue of the law after according the parties the right of argument."

It may be noted that where the courts have been confronted with the full impact of this statutory language, efforts have been made to circumscribe its far-reaching scope. In the *Storer* case cited above, the Supreme Court, in setting forth its views as to when a hearing is required, said that "We agree with the Commission that a full hearing would not be necessary on all such applications. We do not think that Congress intended the Commission to waste time on applications that do not state a valid basis for a hearing." And in holding that where the Commission had promulgated a proscriptive rule of general application, the denial of an application thereunder did not require a prior evidentiary hearing unless the application and accompanying papers "set forth reasons, sufficient if true, to justify a change or waiver of the rules," the Court was apparently atempting to restrict the right to a full evidentiary hearing to those cases presenting substantial issues of fact which were material to a decision on a waiver of the rules. When the *Storer* case was before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 220 F. 2d 204, the court indicated in its opinion that an application could be denied without hearing if the applicant admitted to being an alien or denied without further hearing on any other issue if he is found to be an alien. Again, if an application seeks a license for an unlawful use or purpose, the Supreme Court has indicated that it may be rejected without hearing. *F.C.C.* v. *American Broadcasting Co.*, 347 U.S. 284. Another attempt to clarify the impact of the statutory requirement for hearing is reflected in Judge Prettyman's concurring opinion in the *L. B. Wilson* case, 170 F. 2d 793. In taking issue with the majority view that a petitioner for intervention, no matter what he said in his petition, is entitled to his statutory and constitutional right to an oral hearing, Judge Prettyman stated at pages 807–808 that—

"If the facts alleged in a petition clearly show that rights of the petitioner are involved in the principal proceeding, the petition cannot be denied without a hearing in which the petitioner has an opportunity to prove those facts. If the facts are disputed but there is also a question of law as to whether, even if the facts be true, petitioner's rights are involved, the petition cannot be denied without a hearing upon the legal question; that hearing may consist of an oral argument upon the legal question alone; if it then appears that the alleged facts, if true, show petitioner's rights to be involved, the petition cannot be denied without further hearing upon the truth of the alleged facts." [1]

While these cases would indicate that in the absence of substantial factual questions material to a decision, something less than a full evidentiary hearing would be appropriate under section 309, they constitute only inroads, made in particular situations, on the otherwise all-encompassing language used in this section of the Communications Act. Storer talks in terms of a denial under an established rule of general applicability. Judge Prettyman's statement is simply a concurring opinion in the L. B. Wilson case. The dictum on denial of an alien's application and the American Broadcasting Company case deal with matters of specific statutory prohibition. It is open to serious question that they constitute a basis upon which the Commission can clearly assume authority to deny an application without a full evidentiary hearing after having determined that no genuine and substantial issue as to any fact material to a decision had been presented.

It is proposed to amend section 309 so as to remove any doubt as to the authority of the Commission to follow the above-quoted procedure, described by Judge Prettyman as being in accord with the constitutional requirements of due process. These proposed legislative changes would make clear the responsibility of the Commission initially to determine whether or not there are genuine and substantial issues as to any fact which in its judgment and under its criteria would be material to a decision. If the Commission found such to exist, it would direct the holding of an evidentiary hearing on those issues of fact, the resolution of which it deemed material to an ultimate Commission decision. If the Commission found that no genuine and substantial issue as to any fact material to a decision was presented, but was nonetheless unable to find that a grant would be in the public interest, it would notify the applicant and all of the parties in interest of the reasons therefor and afford them an opportunity to file pleadings with and present oral argument to the Commission with respect to any conclusions and determinations of legal issues by reason of which the Commission was unable to make an affirmative public interest finding. Such a procedure would accord the parties ample opportunity to be heard with respect to the

---

[1] It may be noted that as section 309 then read, a petition for intervention was the means by which a "party in interest" could become a party to the proceedings.

Adopted: March 1, 1961.

conclusions and legal determinations to be drawn from the undisputed, substantial, and material facts set forth in the pleading, without resort to a trial-type hearing, and would not be dissimilar to the summary judgment procedure followed by the Federal Courts under rule 56 of the Rules for Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts, as promulgated by the U.S. Supreme Court under 28 U.S.C. 2072.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO CERTAIN REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER TELEVISION RECEIVING APPARATUS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a justification therefor.

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

The bill (S. 2109) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress a proposal to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by adding new sections 303(s) and 330 to provide that the Commission may prescribe minimum performance capabilities for television receivers, and that no person shall trade or ship in interstate commerce or import from a foreign country any television receiver not complying with such minimum performance capabilities (47 U.S.C. 303(s), 330).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,
NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT, WHICH WOULD EMPOWER THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO REGULATE THE PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS OF TELEVISION RECEIVERS (47 U.S.C. 303, 330)

In the Communications Act of 1934, Congress vested the Federal Communications Commission with the responsibility of making available to all people of the United States an efficient and nationwide communications service, and certain authorities to carry out these responsibilities. Our request for this legislation is an expression of our feeling that in the area of television reception systems, our present authority is not commensurate with our responsibilities, and of our belief that Commission jurisdiction over the performance capabilities of television receivers is necessary to carry out this responsibility. Identical legislation was introduced in the Senate, and similar legislation in the House, during the 86th Congress at the behest of this Commission.

By its very nature, the electromagnetic spectrum is limited, resulting in a ceiling on the number of channels which might be utilized for television. Therefore, to get the greatest television service possible, expansion must be in the direction of more efficient utilization of the portion of the spectrum available for television.

The portion of the spectrum available for nongovernmental television use provides 82 channels. Of these 82 channels, 12 are in the VHF portion of the spectrum and 70 are in the UHF portion. Notwithstanding the availability of many more UHF channels than VHF for television broadcasting, the present situation finds most of the television broadcasting stations crowded into the 12 VHF channels, leaving 70 UHF channels only sparsely occupied. The existing television service is being provided by approximately 450 VHF stations and only 76 UHF stations.

A major reason why the 70 UHF channels are only sparsely occupied is the scarcity of television receivers which are capable of tuning to the UHF frequencies. It is estimated that of some 52 million television receivers throughout the country, only some 8.7 million (less than 17 percent) are capable of receiving television signals which are broadcast in the ultrahigh frequencies (UHF). In 1959, of some 6.35 million television sets manufactured, approximately 7 percent or less than half a million, are capable of receiving UHF signals.

The production of all-channel receivers is somewhat more expensive than either VHF only or UHF only receivers. We are advised, however, that mass production of all-channel receivers would substantially reduce the price differential between VHF-only receivers and all-channel receivers. In any event, we must face the fact that the considerations which impel manufacturers to produce 12-channel sets (VHF only) are fundamentally inconsistent with our allocation of, and national need for, 82-channel channels for television broadcasting. In our view, the two cannot be reconciled.

The scarcity of television receivers capable of tuning to the UHF channels discourages broadcasting on the UHF channels because of the great initial disadvantage of the limited potential audience. UHF stations find it difficult, and in most cases impossible, to compete in markets served by VHF stations mainly because of the aroused skepticism on the part of the advertisers who show a marked preference for VHF outlets in sponsoring programs. UHF broadcasting has only proven to be a success in those few areas where there is no competition with VHF broadcasting. The viewing public has not shown any willingness to unilaterally purchase receivers capable of receiving UHF signals except in those areas where no VHF programs are available. The result is that the public has shown that it will not purchase UHF sets until there are more UHF broadcasters and UHF broadcasting will not increase until the public purchases UHF sets.

The Commission, in order to provide adequate television service within this framework, has examined various methods of extending the use of the 12 VHF channels from merely reducing present minimum cochannel and adjacent channel spacing to an overall reshuffling of television assignments. It has explored the various factors which have frustrated full realization of the goals set forth in its sixth report and order, and it has concluded that although immediate shortages in some communities could be alleviated, no rearrangement of the assignments of the 12 VHF channels can provide for an efficient nationwide television system, adequate for the needs of our growing population and expanding economy. Moreover, the negative reply of OCDM regarding the possibility of obtaining additional VHF spectrum space from the Government makes it clear that television cannot be expanded in the VHF portion of the spectrum in the foreseeable future.

The Commission has now concluded that adequate nationwide television service is not possible within the framework of the 12 VHF channels and that greater use must be made of all of the 82 channels allocated to television, including the 70 UHF channels.

We must recognize receiver incompatibility as a major factor inhibiting development of UHF stations. The Commission proposes to combat receiver incompatibility by legislation designed to promote the manufacture and sale of all-channel receivers capable of satisfactorily receiving UHF television signals. It should be noted that the Commission, in 1952, in its sixth report and order, concluded that a free intermixture of VHF and UHF channels is the solution to the allocations problem. However, to date, the utilization of the UHF has failed to come up to the Commission's expectations in its role as a part of the allocations plan. In a statement to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on February 2, 1960, our Chairman concluded that deintermixing the VHF and UHF assignments to individual cities would not satisfactorily solve the allocations problem facing television broadcasting.

After very comprehensive study over the past several years and repeated explorations of every possibility that has been suggested, we believe the most feasible course with a reasonable prospect for success is the enactment of the legislation to promote the distribution of all-channel receivers.

Without the receiver legislation development of UHF stations will continue to be retarded. In the face of the limited use of the large portion of UHF spectrum space now allocated to television broadcasting, it may be necessary to surrender substantial portions for other pressing needs. The result will be the ultimate confinement of television broadcasting to the wholly inadequate 12-channel VHF system.

It is clear that the 12 VHF channels do not provide adequate opportunities for growth to meet the demand of our expanding economy and that full use must be made of all 82 channels available for television. Any attempts to "squeeze in" any substantial number of additional VHF stations can only result in serious degradation of the quality of television service to metropolitan areas and virtual elimination of such services to many rural areas. Obviously, such a program could not provide an adequate solution to this problem.

Another aspect of this problem which is of deep concern to the Commission is the development of noncommercial educational television and the desire that adequate television services be made available to as many people as possible. This concern is demonstrated by the fact that a television channel

(VHF or UHF) has been reserved for educational use in every large city or educational center in the country. But in many areas where educational service is needed and desired, there are no available VHF channels, necessitating an assignment of a UHF channel to an educational broadcaster. Because of this lack of available VHF channels, the growth and expansion of educational broadcasting must be in the UHF, making the growth of educational television go hand in hand with the growth of the utilization of the UHF. Educational broadcasters find the UHF at the present time to be less desirable (as the commercial stations do) because of receiver incompatibility and they are discouraged by the limited potential audience. In our view, the only hope for an adequate educational television service lies in full utilization of the 70 UHF channels which are not now being fully exploited. So long as most generally available commercial receivers are limited to the VHF portion of the spectrum, educators will be reluctant to go forward with a program for extensive use of UHF frequencies.

If this legislation is not enacted we believe that the Nation will be handicapped with a limited television system with inadequate opportunities for local outlets and adequate educational service and effective competition. We could expect the inequities and monopolistic elements in the present system to become magnified. This would be a result opposed to our national policy and desire for increased competition and inevitably pressures will mount for the adoption of strong measures to overcome the shortages. This may include breakdowns in the technical standards to squeeze in more assignments in the VHF and such regulatory measures as rationing of time on stations.

In closing, we might mention that the UHF project in New York City, authorized by Congress, is progressing satisfactorily and every effort is being made to get the station in actual operation by early fall. One of the principal purposes of the experiment is to determine the feasibility and workability of UHF within large metropolitan areas where many receivers are shielded by high buildings. Additionally, there will be useful byproducts in the form of information concerning receiver characteristics, receiving antennas, transmitter operation, etc. As this information becomes available, it will be used to further UHF development in whatever way practicable.

In view of these circumstances, the Commission must conclude that enactment of the legislation here requested is of utmost importance to the national welfare. We believe that this proposed legislation will promote the interest of the public by better enabling the Commission to carry out its responsibility to make available so far as possible to all of the people of the United States, a rapid, efficient, nationwide wire and radio communication service.

CONCURRING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT E. LEE

I concur in the legislation proposed. However, in justification, the Commission has stressed the need for 82 channels for broadcasting. It is my opinion that the public interest would be better served were television to be shifted to UHF, thereby promoting a more competitive and adequate television system and releasing the VHF bands to meet the needs of other services.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO REFEREES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE COURT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appointment of two referees in the District of Columbia juvenile court. The juvenile court today labors under a backlog of cases which is indefensible by any standards of either legal justice or social compassion.

The District juvenile court is modeled after the Standard Juvenile Court Act, but is not identical with it. The Standard Juvenile Court Act was written by a distinguished group of juvenile court judges and other experts under the auspices of the National Probation and Parole Association.

The standard act has been adopted in whole or in part by approximately one-third of our States. Although the District juvenile court is modeled after this act, referees were not included when the District juvenile court was established.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the District Committee, I am very concerned over the impasse which has been reached in providing additional judges for the District juvenile court. While this matter is debated, and agreement not reached, there are youths in the District who need the help which an efficient juvenile court system could, but cannot now, provide. There is a backlog of cases of juveniles who are not being rehabilitated, and the incidence of juvenile delinquency remains high.

The function of the two proposed juvenile court referees would be to hold preliminary hearings under assignment from the juvenile judge. The findings and hearing record of the referees would be remitted to both the judge and the juvenile's parents or guardians. If the parent, child, or guardian does not appeal within 3 days, the referee's findings shall become the order of the court when signed by the judge.

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the District Committee soon will begin hearings upon this and other pending legislation concerning the District juvenile court. We hope to explore the procedures by which the juvenile court handles cases, and examine the District's methods of providing constructive opportunities for its youth. I expect the Congress will benefit from these hearings which will develop the reasons for legislation authorizing referees in the District juvenile court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2114) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint two individuals as referees of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO MRS. ELMER J. BLOOM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the town of Scituate, Mass., to convey to Mrs. Elmer J. Bloom of Peoria, Ill., a portion of town park property underlying the veranda of a porch of a house owned by her without the park property reverting to the United States.

The necessity for legislative action arises from the fact that the plot in question is a part of a former lighthouse station which was conveyed for $1,000 to the town by the Secretary of Commerce by deed dated June 6, 1917. The deed contained a provision for revision of the property to the United States if it ceased to be maintained by the town as a historic landmark.

It appears that the present occupant of the land involved built a house in 1926, the veranda of which encroached a few feet on the land of the town of Scituate. When an attempt was made recently to rebuild, the encroachment became known. The town cannot cure the situation by a conveyance by reason of the reversionary interest to permit the sale.

The bill would make no changes in existing law, and the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget have expressed no objections. The Treasury Department stated, however, that—

> It would seem only equitable that since the property was originally conveyed for the sole purpose of its being managed as a historic landmark, the United States should receive * * * the fair market value of any land which may be conveyed for waiving its reversionary interests in the land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2115) to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1643) to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interest of consumers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF BENEFITS UNDER OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6027) to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TO REDUCE TEMPORARILY THE DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE OF RETURNING AMERICAN TOURISTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for printing and appropriate reference, an amendment to the bill (H.R. 6611) to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes, which passed the House of Representatives on May 17, 1961.

This bill had been requested by the President as one of the means for dealing with our Nation's balance of payments problem. I believe that the consideration of this legislation should provide the Congress with an opportunity for considering related legislation to eliminate inequities in the tariff laws applicable to tourists which have been a source of irritation both to returning U.S. residents and to foreign visitors coming to our shores.

I therefore propose an amendment to this bill, which would permit visitors to the United States to bring in gifts duty-free up to $100 instead of the present $10 limit. The current limit has been a source of irritation to foreign visitors who cannot understand why U.S. tourists abroad can spend up to $500 while they are limited to $10. This amendment would equalize their situations.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

DETERMINATION THAT CERTAIN COSTS OF OPERATING BANKS LAKE ON COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT ARE NONREIMBURSABLE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2086) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreation purposes are nonreimbursable, introduced by me on June 15, 1961.

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

PROTECTION OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 15, 1961, the name of Mr. SALTONSTALL was added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 105) to provide protection for the golden eagle, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and other Senators) on June 15, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2000, THE PEACE CORPS BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Saturday the Committee on Foreign Relations issued a press release indicating that on June 22 and 23 it was scheduling hearings on S. 2000, the Peace Corps bill. As this is the first time the Senate has been in session since the announcement was made, I wish to repeat the information that on June 22 at 10:30 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, and other administration witnesses will present testimony on S. 2000. On June 23 at 10:30 a.m. the committee will hear private citizens and organization representatives interested in testifying on the bill. All of these hearings will be open to the public and will be held in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Edward T. Wailes, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; and William P. Snow, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Paraguay.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS CONCERNING FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on June 27, 28, and 29, 1961, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will continue its hearings on proposed amendments relating to the system of Federal elections.

Twenty-one Senate Joint Resolutions are under consideration. They concern the method of nomination and election of the President and Vice President, including presidential primaries and electoral college reform, and qualifications for voting including 18-year-old voting, poll taxes, and residence requirements. The numbers of these resolutions are 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, 28, 48, 54, 58, 67, 71, 81, 90, 96, and 102.

Previous hearings have been limited to the testimony of Senators who are sponsors of the various resolutions. The forthcoming meetings are for the purpose of hearing other witnesses, including other Senators, Congressmen, eminent political scientists, and representatives of the executive branch and interested organizations.

The hearing will begin at 9:30 a.m. in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building on each of these days. Persons interested in appearing as witnesses should contact the subcommittee staff in room 141 of the Old Senate Office Building, or by calling extension 5581.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert F. Morey, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. marshal, district of Massachusetts, term of 4 years, vice Ralph W. Gray, deceased.

Leonard T. Heckathorn, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal, district of South Dakota, term of 4 years, vice Bernard A. Boos.

Robert Nelson Chaffin, of Wyoming, to be U.S. attorney, district of Wyoming, term of 4 years, vice John F. Raper, Jr.

Bernard J. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Daniel H. Jenkins.

Frank R. Freeman, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Dale M. Green.

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice John Strickler.

James J. Moos, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Gilbert B. Scheller.

Orville H. Trotter, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Clark W. Gregory.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, June 27, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM HAROLD COX TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

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 Tuesday, June 27, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William Harold Cox, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi, a new position.

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

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROGER J. KILEY TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

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 Tuesday, June 27, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in

room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Roger J. Kiley, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit, vice W. Lynn Parkinson, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings 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.

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

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "How To Start Things Booming Again," published in This Week magazine for June 18, 1961.

ARTICLE ON KANSAS BY ANGELOS TERZAKIS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as this is centennial year in Kansas, we have many visitors, not only from our own country, but from many foreign countries.

In April, the College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans., presented the world premiere in English of the modern Greek drama, "Theophano," by Angelos Terzakis. Mr. Terzakis, the outstanding playwright in Greece today, spent 2 weeks in Emporia during the run of his play. Upon his return to Athens, he wrote some of his impressions of Emporia and Kansas for Vima—Tribune—the leading newspaper of Greece, and one that is referred to as the "New York Times of Greece."

Emporia is the hometown of the late William Allen White, former editor of the Emporia Gazette. Mr. White's articles were recognized both nationally and internationally. He truly represented rural America.

In writing of Kansas, Mr. Terzakis compared life in our large cities and industrial areas with the quiet, serene life in the rural areas. It is regrettable that many of our guests from foreign countries see life only as it prevails in the large cities.

Mr. Terzakis wrote of Kansas:

This State offers to its people everything; namely, health, humanitarian concepts of life, comfort, education, vitality, and peace. In this great State there is no feeling that you live hidden from God, but quite the contrary, "in the right hand of God."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD

Where do men go to find life? In the great centers. There, where flesh and bone are crushed together, where the air becomes rare, full of stagnation, expensive and unhealthy, where avarice dominates, where commonality abounds, where man loses his measurements and becomes a monster.

I understand very well my friends, who returning from America, told me that they couldn't live there. The way of life there does not please them. They had visited the big cities. They had experienced the fever of New York or Chicago. Oh, how I bless my fate that presented me a less ambitious opportunity. I had the privilege and joy to spend 15 days living without the glamorous tones of an American big city.

The real life of a country has nothing to do with its windows (New York, Chicago, etc.). This life is so superb in quality in contrast to the windows. This is because the big city in the final analysis, despite its attempt to present local color, is losing its essence. The impurities that find refuge in them, disforms them. The rushing, pushing, and panting manages to poison their blood. What could you expect from these monstrous blocks where even the air, a basic element of our life, ceases to be natural? Yes, the air, the breath of God, becomes poisonous. You breathe this air constantly and your inner world changes you. But here in this blessed corner of the earth the air smells fresh with the fragrance of new mown hay.

Here the atmosphere elevates the soul and leads your soul to distant memories far behind the individual, personal life and reminds you of Paradise Lost. This peaceful city, which carries the name Emporia, represents a quite different picture from what a European observer is accustomed to seeing in the European Mosaic. Nothing crowded; no cement cities; here an endless park; adorned with lovely dwellings which are charming and joyful; no fences separate neighbors; all things coexist in harmonious company.

I am thinking of the ambiguous picture we have from our distance about life in America. In this blessed city where people sleep without locking their doors, where children leave their bicycles overnight on the grass, I recollect the idea we have of a country dominated by gangsters. This is the distortion of the windows, but it is also the bitter fruit of the many senseless pictures offered by Hollywood.

Not that there are no gangsters in Chicago, but these gangsters do not represent America. America is represented by the people of Kansas who look at you innocently and with faith. People smile at you on the street even though you are a total stranger to them and wholeheartedly offer you their hand and believe whatever you say for the sole reason that you said it. Deep, remote from the noisy megatropolisis, the genuine heart of America functions.

Your soul relaxes seeing so many open sincere faces. One accustomed to the heartless indifferences of foreign countries, to the cold, and neutral glances that pass you, one is surprised upon entering a store to realize that people look at you with warm interest, almost tenderly, and ask about your country proving that they care for you.

This may be rationalized by the remoteness of the Midwest and the fact that a foreigner is a rarity there. This is not the case. And even if this virtue is a result of being remote, then they are truly blessed by God. They revive in you faith and love to man that this century is passionately struggling to destroy.

I have visited large countries where men, if they don't ignore you, are cynical, and never attempt to descend from the icy stage of their political superiority to communicate with you. Or simply, they treat you in an undignified manner. Or they present you with an artificial politeness, paid and mechanical.

In Kansas, nothing of this sort. Not once during my stay in Kansas, and it is hard to say how many I met, did I meet anyone displaying indifference, cynicism, and an affected politeness. The adornment of the American is the simplicity of his heart. And in this sense he is a genuine humanitarian.

Here I met men and women who had never visited New York and, even more surprising, they do not intend or desire to do so. You realize this and feel very happy. In the souls of these people the virus of flight and escapism does not enter. The truth is that that State offers to its people everything; namely, health, humanitarian concepts of life, comfort, education, vitality, and peace. In this great State there is no feeling that you live hidden from God, but quite the contrary, "in the right hand of God."

GEORGE H. BENDER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of sadness that I announce the death of former U.S. Senator George H. Bender.

By election by the citizens of Ohio, he served in the U.S. Senate from November 1954, to fill the unexpired term, ending January 3, 1957, of the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

Former Senator George H. Bender died a comparatively young man, being only 64 years of age.

In his lifetime he was a great protagonist and a powerful leader of the Republican Party in Ohio. He and I waged seven bitterly contested campaigns against each other, for the privilege of representing Ohio as Congressman at Large.

George Bender was a most vigorous and intelligent campaigner and a powerful votegetter.

His activities as a Republican commenced at the age of 16, when he was known as the boy orator of West Commerce High School, in Cleveland.

As a matter of fact, in 1912, when former President Teddy Roosevelt was traveling throughout the Nation being acclaimed by crowds of enthusiastic citizens in various cities, George H. Bender, then only 16 years of age, was in the crowd at the old Union Depot in Cleveland, to cheer Teddy Roosevelt as his train was passing through that city. It is noteworthy that on that occasion George Bender obtained from Teddy Roosevelt the information the entire country was waiting to learn. He shouted to the former President, "Are you going to run against President Taft?" Teddy Roosevelt shouted back to George Bender and to the entire throng, "My hat is in the ring." That was the historic reply of Teddy Roosevelt to the 16-year-old boy who later attained statewide and national prominence.

I knew George Bender well, over the years. As I have said, we were bitter political rivals. In later years we came to know each other even better, and I have held him in the highest personal regard. Throughout his life George H. Bender was a very personable, engaging, pleasant, and most intelligent man. As a Member of the other body for 14 years and as a Member of the Senate for 2 years, he justifiably took pride in the service he rendered his constituents and his country. He was vigorous and boisterous in politics and intensely hard working in every office—appointive and elective—which he held.

In the course of his political career, he addressed more Republican meetings than any two leaders of the Republican Party in my State throughout that same period.

He crisscrossed the State of Ohio many times in his campaigns, from his first political speeches in Teddy Roosevelt's 1912 campaign for the Presidency to a few days before he suddenly died of a heart attack last Sunday. At one time he was justly regarded as one of the greatest vote getters of the Republican Party in Ohio.

Early in his career he was a member of the Ohio Senate for five consecutive terms. He ran unsuccessfully for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1930, 1932, 1934, 1936, and 1948. In 1938 he was elected Congressman at Large. In 1940 he and I were both elected to that office. He was reelected continuously to 1948. Then in 1950, which was the last time Ohio elected a Congressman at Large, he defeated me for that office. In 1952, he was elected from his district. In 1940, the last year Ohio was represented by two Congressmen at Large, the citizens of Ohio were good to me and reelected me for my third term. They also reelected George H. Bender who ran ahead of every Republican candidate on the ticket in Ohio that year and defeated my running mate, a very able and active campaigner. It was one of his greatest victories.

I would say that another great victory achieved by George H. Bender was when he defeated me in 1950, after intensive campaigns by both of us.

Those two occasions, and his election in 1954, when he was elected to the Senate, and defeated a notable Democrat, a former mayor of Cleveland, were three outstanding victories in the political career of George H. Bender.

During that time the confidence and the love that the Republican Party of Ohio had for George Bender was evidenced by the fact that he served as the elected chairman of the Republican Party of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, the most populous county in the State.

Following his defeat for reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1956 by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, George Bender was appointed and served as special assistant to Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton. Among his duties was the important function of promoting tourism in Alaska and the Virgin Islands. He handled this assignment with characteristic vigor. He performed outstanding work in that capacity and spoke with fervor in favor of Alaska's admission into the Union.

Throughout the years, he was an effective party leader and helped elect many Republican candidates for office in Ohio.

He, of course, was to the end a controversial figure. He had many, many friends and supporters throughout the entire State of Ohio. Without a doubt, he had spoken in every county, every city, and practically every village in Ohio in the course of his many campaigns.

George H. Bender was a strong, stalwart Republican leader in the State and in our Nation. Furthermore, he was an affable, genial man personally, and during the past 10 years no political rivalry existed between him and me. On occasions when I would meet with him I came to regard him as a friendly, personable, jovial fellow townsman.

I know that the Republican Party of my State of Ohio has lost an attractive, outspoken leader. Where political leaders meet in Washington, in Cleveland, and elsewhere in the Nation, men and women who have been drawn to George H. Bender during the course of his colorful career will speak with affection regarding him personally, his political activities, and his achievements throughout an active life.

Our sympathy goes to his wife, who was his loving partner throughout the years; to his two daughters, and to his grandchildren. May I testify that Mrs. Bender was always a great asset to her husband.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted to note the testimony and tribute paid to the late George Bender by our distinguished friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I served in the House with George Bender for many years, and also served with him in the Senate. He was, by all odds, one of the most vigorous and one of the most courageous persons who ever served in public life. I did not always share his views. I did not always agree with him in either body of Congress. There were many times, I believe I can say, when he was on one side of a proposition and I was on the other. But it must be said that, in courageous and uninhibited fashion, he expressed his convictions as he felt them, and I believe rendered great services to his constituency in Cleveland and the people of the State of Ohio.

I join my distinguished colleague in extending sympathy to his family, and noting the fact that a great public servant has passed away.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to express my tribute to the late Senator Bender, with whom I served in the House, and who was devoted to his party. I shall never forget the convention at Philadelphia, when George Bender, who was supporting the great Bob Taft, sang "I Have a Four-Leaf Clover." That is one of the freshest memories I have of him.

I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his family. He was a very distinguished, fine, and outgoing human being.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join my distinguished friend from Illinois and my distinguished colleague from Ohio in the expression of regret at the passing of George Bender, a man with whom I served in the House of Representatives and the Senate, a man who had a notable career, and whose character exemplified all that we should expect in a public servant.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to note and join in the statements that have been made by Members of the Senate in regard to the death of a former great Member of this body, George Bender. George and I served together in the House of Representatives and the Senate. He was an outstanding leader, and one of my good friends.

I extend my sympathy to his family.

JOHN PAUL JONES, AMERICA'S FIRST NAVAL HERO

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, history and tradition unite in declaring that one of North Carolina's most eminent citizens of all times, Willie Jones, admitted a wandering and penniless Scotch lad, John Paul, into his famous home, Grove House, which formerly stood in the town of Halifax, one of the colonial capitals of North Carolina. Here John Paul lived for a time as a member of the Jones family and no doubt acquired the devotion to his adopted land which ultimately made him America's first great naval hero. All the schoolchildren of our land are familiar with his heroic exclamation, "I have not yet begun to fight," when the commander of the British frigate, *Serapis*, called upon him to surrender his damaged ship, the *Bonhomme Richard*, when these two vessels met in combat off Flamborough Head, England.

As a consequence of his appreciation for the kindness shown him by the head of Grove House, John Paul adopted the surname of Willie Jones as his own, and for this reason is known to history as John Paul Jones.

Some years ago, Mrs. Margaret Overman Gregory, of Salisbury, N.C., and other patriots, who treasured in their memories the valiant services rendered by John Paul Jones in the naval service of our country, formed the John Paul Jones Association and acquired the site upon which his North Carolina home, Grove House, stood. At that time, Mrs. Gregory made a statement concerning the connection between Grove House and John Paul Jones, which should be of interest to all Americans who revere the memory of John Paul Jones. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

In acquiring the site of Grove House, the John Paul Jones Association was desirous of restoring this famous dwelling and perpetuating the memory of John Paul Jones who had resided there in his formative days. As president of the John Paul Jones Association, Mrs. Gregory is anxious to see these objects accomplished and to have this historic site made a national shrine with title to the property vested in some appropriate governmental agency or some patriotic society. This is a most worthy objective and ought to be consummated.

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

WOMEN ORGANIZE A SOCIETY TO SAVE THE HOME OF JOHN PAUL JONES

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 4, 1915.

"I am too devoted an American," said Mrs. Edwin Clark Gregory of Salisbury, N.C., "to admit our country is more ungrateful than republics are generally, but I do wish we had shown more appreciation of John Paul Jones. The intrepid naval commander, dead or alive, should give the national conscience a twinge whenever the subject is prominent, and it is every time we study the history of the war of independence.

"Of course, the splendid service of Gen. Horace Porter in a large measure made

reparation for the century of neglect, but it is almost humiliating to reflect that this service was the work of love of one generous-spirited public man rather than the prompting of the Nation. Still, we have the revered remains of John Paul Jones reposing in a stately mausoleum at Annapolis, and every embryo naval hero going forth from the hallowed shades of the Naval Academy is steeped in reverence to his memory.

"For this we are all very grateful. But down in the old colonial capital of North Carolina, Halifax, the splendid home where John Paul Jones spent his happy days, the only home he ever knew or loved, is crumbling to decay. Every North Carolina woman with a grain of patriotism has been saddened at the picture of ruin the old Jones mansion presents, and we tried many means to rescue it before we came before the Nation with our plea. John Paul Jones is a national hero, and not altogether a North Carolina celebrity, so it seems proper to have the entire Nation take up the work we have been vainly urging in the State, in the local DAR, and afterward at the Continental Congress.

"It is our purpose to found a society similar to that which has preserved Mount Vernon; to have regents and vice regents from every State, with as large membership as we may. The financial obligation will be almost negligible, and the glory of having accomplished something of splendid, patriotic usefulness will be great. Our president is to be Gen. Horace Porter, and the honorary presidents will be Mrs. Marshall, all of the cabinet ladies, Mrs. George Dewey, Mrs. Donald McLean, and Mrs. Matthew T. Scott. There will also be a list of honorary presidents selected from eminent naval officers, of whom Admiral Dewey is typical.

"Vice presidents will be selected from every State, with the central authority vested in the board resident in Washington. Just now all we have decided to do is to organize this memorial society to preserve the home. Later we will decide to what use we will put the venerable mansion. A home for aged women has been suggested, or, again, a school wherein patriotism will be the inspiration, but where boys and girls will be equipped for the battle of life, the boys in technical pursuits, the girls along domestic economic lines.

"It is also proposed simply to restore the old home, furnished as nearly as it was in the days when the sad eyed, youthful Scotch sailor, John Paul, accepted the cheery invitation of Willie Jones to visit him at the Grove, and to keep it in perpetuity as a memorial of our greatest revolutionary naval hero. Personally, I favor this last idea, as more dignified, more useful, and more in harmony with historic traditions.

"Of the mansion, I find so few know of it even superficially that to spread this knowledge is of itself a useful propaganda. The benefactor of John Paul figures in the annals as Willie Jones. Possibly he was the son of that Robin Jones, a highlander of gentle blood, who was attorney general of North Carolina under royal rule. His manorial estate, called the Grove, was renowned in prerevolutionary days for hospitality and for the distinguished guests entertained there.

"Allen Jones, brother of Willie Jones, became a general in the patriotic army and later served his State signally in the legislature. The Jones mansion, though now in pathetic ruins, retains much of its former beauty. All the wood, carved and richly stained, came from England. No home in the South can show more stately halls and drawing rooms, while the stairways are marvels even yet. The daintiest of parquetry, still intact after 3 years of neglect, adorns the floors of the pretty music room, and satinwood in panels, with lovely Cupids flying about the dado, proclaims the wealth and culture of the Jones family.

"It was to this beautiful home that Willie Jones brought the youthful Scotch sailor, John Paul. Mr. Jones had met him previously in Virginia. Later when the adventuresome were gathering in large numbers about Halifax he again encountered the Scotch boy and, feeling pity for his lack of success in the new country, cordially asked him to the Grove until his fortune mended. From that time the history of John Paul mingles intimately with that of the Jones family, and to study the one is to secure records of both. From letters and papers of the day we learn that the Scotch sailor was almost unlettered and that at once the generous host began to take his education in hand.

"His great intellect showed itself instantly, so that after a few years' tutorship in the home of his benefactor we find the daring sea fighter emerging a polished man of letters, graceful and accomplished, versed in the ways of the world, but yet so unworldly that he asked and received permission to add the name Jones to his own, the greatest tribute he could pay and one which assured its immortality. It is John Paul Jones henceforth in the record, and while its bearer remained on American soil his steps bent toward the Grove and it was to him a refuge and support, even as Mount Vernon was to Washington, Monticello to Jefferson, Sunnyside to Irving.

"It was in the grand and sumptuous main drawing room that Commodore Jones received the sword now so sacredly guarded in the Navy Department. And in the fine old library, where the ancient mahogany has defied time and the abuse of Negro tenants, Willie Jones wrote his friend, Joseph Hewes, chairman of naval affairs in the Continental Congress sitting in Philadelphia, commending to his good offices his young protege John Paul. This letter undoubtedly obtained for the ambitious youth his first commission in the Continental Navy.

"Then, at the request of Willie Jones, Hewes interested himself in the valor of young John Paul Jones and gave him full support from his adopted State, North Carolina. Lastly, Gov. Samuel Johnson wrote to Mr Jones in 1789 that the State intended to present a bust of Chevalier John Paul Jones to the statehouse in Raleigh, Chevalier Jones being among the foremost revolutionary heroes who derived their appointment from North Carolina. This intention unfortunately seemed to have been deferred and finally was lost sight of in the lapsing years.

"Though the mansion has been so long neglected, we of North Carolina, who always hoped to restore it, have sufficient records of the interior decoration to refit the home with historical accuracy. We have some of the wallpaper from the drawing rooms and the sleeping apartments. Among the ancient gentry there are pieces of the tapestry and of the brocade which adorned the staterooms, and splendid old furniture like that of Monticello and Mount Vernon can easily be traced to the purchasers. Indeed, though the society is merely peeping out of its shell and we have as yet had no chance to make a general appeal, we have received hundreds of offers to aid in the restoration, by gift or by duplicating known ornaments in the Jones home."

Under the direction of Miss Ursula Daniel of Halifax, the house has been taken down and the timbers saved, so that it can be restored at any desired time. Much interest and history have been connected with the site. On May 3, 1915, the John Paul Jones Association was started. On July 3 of that year, it was incorporated under the laws of the State of North Carolina and the deed to the Grove House with 3 acres of land, including the historic burial ground, was signed, sealed, and delivered to the association.

The following members were elected the first officers: honorary presidents: Mrs. Josephus Daniels, Mrs. George Dewey, Mrs. Donald McLean, and Mrs. Matthew T. Scott; honorary vice presidents, Mrs. William Jennings Bryan, Mrs. William G. McAdoo, Mrs. Thomas W. Gregory, Mrs. Albert S. Burleson, Mrs. Franklin K. Lane, Mrs. David F. Houston, Mrs. William C. Redfield, Mrs. William B. Wilson, Miss Ursula Daniel, and Mrs. Edwin C. Gregory; secretary, Mrs. Gregory; treasurer, Mrs. Herbert Jackson; and historian, Mrs. William Owen.

Grove House, was built in 1764 by Willie Jones, much of the material having been brought from England. From the standpoints of colonial architecture and beautiful location, it was exceptionally interesting, as well as from its historic associations.

The father of Willie Jones was Robin Jones, agent and attorney for Lord Granville. He settled at Roanoke and attained wealth and distinction. Two of his children, Allen and Wiley, were educated at Eton, England. The former was a general in the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War.

Wiley Jones was a noted pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary patriot. As president of the committee of Safety for North Carolina, he was Acting Governor. He had an important part in the forming of the State and the Constitution. His wife was Mary Montford, of a famous colonial family.

The incorporators of the John Paul Jones Association were U.S. Senator Lee Overman, Hon. Edwin C. Gregory, Mrs. Edwin C. Gregory, and Miss Ursula Daniels.

"In my association with women of every section," said Mrs. Gregory, "I find patriotism is a theme to which almost everyone will respond. I have met with some touching instances of devotion to an ideal while assisting in the formation of this John Paul Jones Association. There is Mrs. William Owen, wife of Colonel Owen, who is the executive head of the Southern Industrial Congress. Mrs. Owen was one of the earliest to join the ranks of those committed to preserve the home of John Paul Jones and of the other honorable occupants of the grove. She at once set about devising means for revenue, for the country is sorely stricken and few have available money to put into any society, no matter how worthy.

"We do not wish this new patriotic effort to be a drain on any of the members, and our aim from the beginning has been to make the cost of the project small, so that all will feel able to afford it. Mrs. Owen conceived the idea of presenting the entire life of Commodore Jones in a scenario and to get the motion films produced under such auspices as would most profit our organization. She intends to turn over the entire proceeds to the society, and it is the most generous offer we have yet received.

"She has at infinite pains produced the early scenes of John Paul's life, the ancient sea town of Arbigland, where he was born; the tiny school in the hills which he attended for a few months; the old kirk, rising white and inviting from the knolls, where he went to service with his relatives; then, his sea life with its thrilling adventures, and all portrayed to inspire veneration for the youth who became so renowned a hero. His sad life, when, at the tender age of 12, he was bound as an apprentice to a merchant at Whitehaven, which led to his voyage to Virginia, where his brother was a planter. All this has been done so delicately and so many points brought forward which are good for all to know.

"The scenario shows that John Paul went into the slave business, but left it in disgust, and the rollicking days of his freelance career at sea and on down until fortune brought him to the favorable notice of Willie Jones. From this part on, the home at the Grove will be depicted in all its aspects and

in this way we will present to those members not able to see the mansion itself a faithful view of it as we hope to keep from this time forward.

"I think this scenario alone a worthy patriotic service to the nation and I am sure it is one which will meet with instant success. We hope to begin in the public schools throughout the country, and the various State regents will be charged with this program. Later we will exhibit generally and always with full explanation of the purpose. Our American women, I think, rise most nobly to all such work as this. It is only necessary to look at Mount Vernon and see the possibilities of these memorial associations. It is a gentle work for the present and succeeding generations. I hope to see the day when every home of the founders of the republic are cared for by the women of the country."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD AT NINTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION AND CATHOLIC YOUNG ADULT CLUBS OF NEW ENGLAND

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Sunday, June 18, it was my privilege and pleasure to address the ninth annual congress of the Catholic Youth Organization and the Catholic Young Adult Clubs of New England.

I was greatly encouraged and pleased by what I saw at this congress. Here was a large group of vigorous, intelligent, earnest young people who are anxious to act constructively and effectively in improving the moral and ethical tone of our society. I congratulate these young people on the achievements of their organizations and on the success of their ninth annual congress.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION AND THE CATHOLIC YOUNG ADULT CLUBS OF NEW ENGLAND, HOTEL STATLER HILTON, HARTFORD, CONN., SUNDAY, JUNE 18, 1961

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be here with you this afternoon.

I enjoy being with groups of young people. I always gain something from your infectious spirit of optimism, enthusiasm, and confidence.

In thinking about what to say to you this afternoon, there came to my mind an incident that occurred 25 years ago when I was a young man of about the same age as some of you.

I was attending the ceremonies at Franklin Field in Philadelphia at which Franklin D. Roosevelt accepted renomination for a second term. This scene, with its flags and bunting, its pageantry and martial music, its throng of over 100,000 excited, cheering people, was an event for any young man to remember.

During his memorable acceptance speech, President Roosevelt made one statement which impressed me then and has stayed in my mind since. He said: "To some generations, much is given. Of other generations, much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

Every part of that statement applies to the young people of your generation.

To you, much has been given.

You are the heirs of Western civilization, of a 3,000-year spiritual heritage, and of the American experiment in freedom and opportunity.

You have been spared all of the ancient curses of man—toil, disease, famine, poverty, war, enslavement, exploitation.

Throughout your lives you have been safe, secure, well fed, well cared for.

From you, therefore, much is expected. It is for you to prove that safety need not breed weakness, that freedom from toil need not breed softness, that material wealth need not breed selfishness, that inherited success need not breed incompetence, that well-being need not breed complacency.

Your generation will surely have a significant encounter with destiny. It will be your fate either to meet and throw back the advancing tide of Communist tyranny or to be subjugated and enslaved by it.

You are opposed by a young generation behind the Iron Curtain which is being trained to wage war while you are being raised to enjoy peace. You are opposed by a generation which is driven to exertion which you would regard as inhuman and fantastic, a generation which works harder, studies harder, sacrifices more than you do.

You are opposed by millions and millions of youths who are ruthlessly disciplined and purposefully directed, not to serve their own well-being but to advance the welfare of the regime which has sworn to bury us.

A successful career for you may involve talent in art or literature or entertainment, or skill in any of the industries built around the satisfaction of consumer wants and desires, or mastery of those professions dedicated to the satisfaction of human needs and comforts.

But to your contemporary behind the Iron Curtain, all personal success, all hope of personal achievement, is measured by his or her ability to contribute to the aggressive designs of world communism. The rewards in the Communist world go to technicians, not television stars; to saboteurs, not salesmen; to political propagandists, not public relations men.

We know that our free society is superior to theirs in the attainment of every decent, praiseworthy objective of mankind. What remains to be proven is whether or not our society is superior in the mortal struggle for survival which they have forced upon us.

The crucial question is whether or not freemen can discipline themselves, whether or not they will make the effort by their own consent that their opponents are forced to make, whether or not they will use the thousandfold superiority of a free society over a slave state primarily for ministering to their own material desires or for advancing the cause of freedom and social justice in the world.

Your opponents may be unwilling conscripts in the war to impose slavery upon the world; but they will win unless you become willing volunteers in the struggle to preserve and extend freedom.

In the words of Edmund Burke, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

You may say that it is all well and good to state the problem in general terms, but what can you, a single individual, do about it?

In a free society, everything starts with the individual. If the average American is strong, physically, mentally and morally, then our country will be strong.

If the average American is dedicated to preserving his civil rights and freedoms and those of his neighbor, then our country will be effective in extending those rights and freedoms.

If the average American has courage, then our foreign policy will reflect that courage.

If the average American is generous and self-sacrificing, then our country will make those grave sacrifices which it must make to help our unfortunate friends in the world achieve a decent existence and to protect their independence and their freedom.

So the first thing you can do is to take a critical look at yourself.

Let's talk, for instance, about physical fitness.

All of our young people ought to be deeply interested in this question of physical fitness. The average American youth is unable to pass a physical examination that his contemporaries who grew up in war-ravaged Europe can pass easily. On some physical tests, European girls came out better than American boys. The strength of our Nation is directly involved here. One out of every two American boys is either physically or mentally unfit to serve in our Armed Forces.

So you ought to be concerned, for your own sake and the sake of your country, lest a life of ease and softness makes you unfit for the exertions which may be required of you.

If you are a student, the chances are that you ought to be working harder, studying harder, than you are or than your school requires you to. Dr. WALTER JUDD, that outstanding Congressman who many of you remember as the keynote speaker at the Republican National Convention, recently told of graduation exercises in one of the largest high schools in his home State of Minnesota. The five top honor students in this high school were all children who had come here from Eastern Europe as displaced persons. Dr. JUDD pointed out that these honor students were not necessarily smarter than many other boys and girls in that class. Certainly they had grown up without many of our advantages. But they worked harder, they appreciated more the privileges offered by American life, and as a result they outclassed their American classmates.

If you are a young man of military age, don't shrink from service in our Armed Forces. Don't try to find ways to get out of it. Don't be cynical about it.

Our armed services are desperately in need of people of the highest quality, people who are intelligent and dedicated, who will wear their uniform with pride and distinction, who can master a tougher and more exacting course of training than ever before and who are willing to serve out their full term and then some more if their country needs them.

The other day in Washington the Senate was debating a $9 billion housing bill. The debate was in its 12th consecutive hour. Complicated amendments affecting perhaps millions of people were being voted upon every hour. As the time advanced toward midnight, Senators grew more and more weary and nerves became more and more frayed. At that point, someone began circulating a card from desk to desk with a question printed on it in bold letters.

It said, "Do you have a solution or are you part of the problem? It was of course intended to be humorous and it had that effect.

But as I have thought about it since, it seems to me that that card contained a question that each of us might well ask himself. Are we providing answers, solutions, improvements for our society and our country, or are we merely adding to the burden which our country must carry as it tries at the same time to meet its implacable foe?

You can serve yourself and the Nation by resolving now to prepare yourselves for a lifetime of independence and self-reliance; to be a producer as well as a consumer; to be a giver rather than a receiver; to take care of yourself rather than be taken care of, to support your Government rather than be supported by your Government.

Equally important is the influence you can have on shaping our national attitudes. The American Government does not automatically base its policies on what is in the best national interest. The national interest might call for sacrifice, for struggle, for risk and our Government, being free, can only take those steps if the American people are willing to take them.

You can throw your weight, if you will, behind action, public and private, local and national, that a strong, successful America requires, action that will remove racial discrimination, throttle organized crime, clean up our television, movies and magazines.

You can support greater national and personal effort to build a more powerful military posture, to provide more effective assistance to those impoverished nations which are trying to preserve their freedom, to embark upon a vastly more extensive program in space and other areas of scientific research.

We will not survive unless we do these things and we will not do these things unless you of the new generation are willing to support with your tax dollars, with your service, with your votes and with your zeal these policies and the men and women in public life who advocate them.

You have a grand adventure ahead of you and an unprecedented opportunity to leave your mark for good upon human history. Your active membership in the Catholic Youth Organization and the Young Adult Clubs shows that you are already at work in the kind of activity that will make all the difference in coming decades.

It has been a real privilege and a pleasure for me to participate in your Ninth Annual Congress and I wish you good luck and success in the coming year and in all the years ahead.

NEED FOR CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the fact that the administration, notwithstanding the great need for it, has not been coming to Congress for civil rights legislation at this session of Congress.

I point out that a Federal judge in Virginia has just denied intervention by the Department of Justice to join in litigation seeking to reopen schools in Prince Edward County, which schools have been closed. This is another evidence of the assertions which I and others have made that the Department needs statutory authority to intervene and initiate suits in civil rights cases.

I hope very much the administration will come to the same conclusion I have reached, that in order to deal with the situation Congress must be tied in it. This is one of the problems we have been having in regard to some disorder which has taken place in certain Southern States. Until Congress takes its responsibility, the executive will find itself handicapped and, indeed, crippled, in endeavoring to deal with the situation.

I do not believe this is advancing the President's program one bit. I think the President is simply avoiding a very essential issue in terms of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Investment in Ignorance."

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

INVESTMENT IN IGNORANCE

Federal Judge Oren Lewis has taken a very narrow view of the facts in rejecting the intervention of the Department of Justice to reopen the public schools in Prince Edward County. The Department's plea to enter the case as a plaintiff was admittedly a departure from previous practice, but there was the justification of an effort to speed a remedy for a situation in which some 1,400 Negro children have been deprived of schooling for 2 long years.

In particular, Judge Lewis magnified out of proportion the Government's request to enjoin Virginia from spending public funds for support of schools anywhere until those in Prince Edward are reopened. This was patently not an attempt to close schools elsewhere; it was an effort to devise a lever by which to induce State and local authorities to meet their responsibility. The broad focus of the action was upon the obvious denial of equal protection of the laws.

Whether the timing of the Department's course was politically wise, in view of the ammunition it gave the diehard forces in the contest for the Virginia gubernatorial nomination, is a matter of some debate. But the closure of public schools, which in effect enshrines ignorance as a public policy, is a situation to which no one can really be indifferent, and every legal means is warranted to bring relief.

Actually, a great many Virginians have troubled consciences about the plight of Prince Edward County. There are even indications that county authorities, even though they have again denied funds for operation of public schools, have begun to heed the moral pressures. If public schools were available to those who wished to attend them, what other children did would be immaterial.

Irrespective of the outcome of the court case bearing upon the legality of public grants for private school tuition, and irrespective of the action of Prince Edward County officials, the State of Virginia itself has a direct obligation in the matter. Section 129 of the Virginia constitution reads: "The General Assembly shall establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State." This remains the basic law; and so long as it is not enforced in Prince Edward County children there are being deprived of their rights under the Virginia as well as the Federal Constitution.

NIGERIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, many people like myself are always pointing out our problems with respect to race relations, especially when violence results in hurting us very materially abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that a column entitled "We Help the Reds in Nigeria," written by Ralph McGill, the great southern editor, published in the Washington Evening Star the 14th of this month, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the article shows very clearly how, in this great country, which contains a larger population than any other independent country in Africa and upon which we depend very heavily in the struggle for freedom, all of our efforts tend to be colored by the fact that the newspapers take a very dim outlook of what happened, for example, in Alabama when the racial situations took place there.

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

WE HELP THE REDS IN NIGERIA—SEGREGATION EVENTS IN AMERICAN SOUTH VIEWED AS BOON TO COMMUNISTS

(By Ralph McGill)

A young man in the Foreign Service of the United States in Africa sent along tear sheets of 1 day's issues of two of Nigeria's major newspapers, the Daily Express and the Nigerian Outlook.

The headlines, on stories from Alabama, were these:

"Negro Boy Soaked With Petrol, Then Set afire by U.S. Mob."

"Race Horror Flares Up."

"Another Major Race Clash in America; Martial Law Declared."

In a letter written from Enugu, Nigeria, he said:

"It is difficult to appreciate the rapid change in this part of the world without being on the scene. The amount of work here is vast and the problems difficult. The rising issues in the Congo, the nationalist outlook and the emerging independent nations of Africa need all the help and sympathy the more advanced nations can offer. The sooner the response, the better it will be for us and the world. This experience, as I see it, unveils our lack of efforts in this part of the world. We should have been here 20 years ago, even longer.

"Our most difficult job here is not with the people but with a well-organized conspiracy that uses every chance to deceive and discredit. The racial issue in the United States has been one of the most valuable weapons in the hands of those looking for an opportunity to drive a wedge between the African countries and the Western Powers. Naturally, we get the brunt of the complaint, and it is simply because they can point to New Orleans, Little Rock, and incidents involving African dignitaries visiting the United States. Now comes the news from Alabama.

"The Congo has added a lot to the feeling of mistrust. The attacks on the Embassy in Lagos and other demonstrations can, of course, be traced to a latent feeling aroused by our adversaries. There remains a lot to undo here and a lot to do at home to regain and continue to build American prestige. We make progress only to have it nullified by news from the South.

"The appointments of qualified American Negroes to high posts by President Kennedy have won considerable favor from African leadership here. The fact that white and black can work together in America is another fact that interests them very much. The appointment of more qualified Negroes to serve abroad would, at this time, be an 'ace card' in the hands of the United States. These appointments need not be restricted to African countries alone. Small European nations are being used indirectly to infiltrate Africa with communism. I am sure you are aware of this. If Americans can be made to understand how much racial violence and discrimination assist communism, perhaps they would be willing to bring it to an end. If we don't * * *"

The problem is a national one, but the immediacy of it is in the South.

The States of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana cannot forever agitate and provoke violence by refusing to follow court rulings and Interstate Commerce Commission rulings, some 16 years old, which forbid segregation of interstate bus and railway stations.

Montgomery cannot long endure the absurdity of having long had desegregated lo-

cal bus service, but still turning out mobs to enforce segregation at the bus terminal.

If persons who are within their rights are mobbed and thrown into jail, we will sow and reap a harvest of greater violence.

The Freedom Riders, and those citizens who are denied the right to vote, do not need Communists to tell them of injustices. But if indefensible defiance of laws and ICC regulations continues, the Communists will profit most. They already are profiting in Nigeria.

The real leadership of the South, which so long has been doing nothing, now must act. It can only begin with acceptance of the fact that the Negro citizen is entitled to the rights which citizenship gives—no more and no less. This is a simple admission. It does no violence to private or social life. But nothing can be done in the South that does not start from this basic admission.

COMMUNIST FOREIGN AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a news statement published in the New York Times, which shows that the Communists are giving us very hot competition in foreign aid. This fact bears very materially upon what we shall do with regard to our foreign aid program, which will be one of the most contested of all programs to come before the Senate this year.

The Communists are giving away about a billion dollars in economic aid this year. Let those who are deeply concerned about the size of our foreign aid program ponder that situation before they come to a final conclusion.

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

RED BLOC SPURS AID TO NEUTRALS—GRANTED BILLION IN ECONOMIC FIELD ALONE LAST YEAR—TRADE DRIVE PRESSED

(By Seymour Topping)

Moscow, June 18.—At a gay party in the Kremlin for President Sukarno of Indonesia, Premier Khrushchev pulled out his pockets and said, beaming: "Look, he took everything I had."

Mr. Khrushchev was jesting in the expansive mood of the successful banker. Indonesia is one of the 20 underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America that are receiving Soviet aid.

The Soviet Union and other members of the Communist bloc are rapidly expanding their economic, technical, and military assistance to the uncommitted nations.

The Communist countries allocated more than $1 billion in economic aid alone last year, according to Western estimates. This was the biggest annual outlay since the Communist program for the underdeveloped countries made its modest beginning in 1954. In 1960 more than 6,000 Communist technicians were present in those countries.

The Communists' plan for economic penetration also relies heavily on growing trade, including the sale of equipment that will require replacement parts from the Communist suppliers. Communist bloc salesmen are increasingly active at trade exhibitions and as members of exchange missions.

A study of the bloc's trade with the underdeveloped countries in the first half of 1960, compared with the same period of 1959, indicated an increase of about 20 percent.

By comparison with U.S. aid outlays, Communist bloc expenditures are relatively small.

Since 1954, it is estimated, the bloc has provided credits and some grants amounting to roughly $5 billion, about 70 percent in the economic field and the rest military. Actual deliveries, however, have averaged less than $200 million a year.

Proposed U.S. foreign aid for the next fiscal year alone would allocate $2,890 million for economic assistance and $1,885 million for military help.

Some Western and neutral experts here believe that, proportionately, the Communist bloc has reaped greater propaganda benefits than the United States.

Communist aid often is tied more closely to political objectives than is U.S. assistance, although there are no obvious strings attached. The Communists make greater propaganda flourishes in every phase of their aid programs, from the negotiating to the supplying stages. Dramatic impact is achieved through a careful selection of showpiece projects, such as the giant Aswan High Dam in the United Arab Republic and the Bhilai iron and steel plant in India.

The nature of Soviet projects usually requires that Moscow train the recipient country's technicians and workers. For the Bhilai plant, more than 700 Indian engineers and other personnel were trained in the Soviet Union. Several thousand Indian construction workers were trained on the site by Soviet specialists.

Like the United States, the Soviet Union is having its share of unhappy experiences with aid recipients. Moscow is learning that an aid program does not insure the favorable orientation of a country's policies.

This is the case with the United Arab Republic and Iraq. The Soviet Union has invested heavily in both and now finds the attitudes of their Governments decidedly cool.

Despite these disappointments, Premier Khrushchev apparently is going ahead with programs for these two countries and is rapidly expanding foreign assistance generally.

The importance the Communists attach to the programs can be judged by the fact that a country as hard pressed economically as Communist China has since 1954 allocated almost $400 million. The East European countries have provided somewhat less than $1 billion. The rest of the $5 billion earmarked up to the end of 1960 came from the Soviet Union.

According to Soviet statistics, Moscow has already granted credits totaling more than 2 billion rubles ($2,222 million) in economic assistance to 20 underdeveloped countries. More than 4,000 Soviet technicians were said to be at work in these countries.

SENECA NATION OF INDIANS SUPPORTS AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am particularly gratified to have received from the president of the Seneca Nation of Indians a resolution adopted by the council of the Seneca Nation, expressing its support for Senate Joint Resolution 84, which I sponsored, to establish the fourth Friday of September of every year as American Indian Day, in which 43 of my Senate colleagues joined me.

The support of this Indian nation, whose treaty rights are even now being considered under the Kinzua Dam project, is particularly gratifying.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from Basil Williams, president of the Seneca Nation of Indians, be printed in the body of the RECORD. I hope that this additional expression of support from an Indian nation, like many others which have been received by Members of the Senate, may result in prompt enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 84, and the proclamation of this celebration by the President.

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

THE SENECA NATION OF INDIANS,
Salamanca, N.Y., June 12, 1961.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Re Senate Joint Resolution 84.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The council of the Seneca Nation of Indians, at a regular session held June 5, 1961, took the following action relative to the "Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day":

"That the Seneca Nation of Indians go on record as urging the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 84 and that Senator JAVITS be so advised."

Thank you for your interest in not only the Seneca Indians but all American Indians.

Very truly yours,

BASIL WILLIAMS,
President.

STATEMENT OF NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL LEFKOWITZ ON SCHOOL CLOSINGS IN LOUISIANA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in reply to a request to State attorneys general from the U.S. District Court for Eastern Louisiana, the distinguished attorney general of New York State, Louis J. Lefkowitz, submitted a letter to the court setting out his strong belief, and that of the State of New York, in the constitutional protection of the right to public education. I believe that his reply will be of interest to the Members of the Senate and to the entire Nation, and I ask unanimous consent that his letter addressed to the court be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Hon. JOHN MINOR WISDOM,
Hon. HERBERT W. CHRISTENBERRY,
Hon. J. SKELLY WRIGHT,
U.S. Courthouse,
New Orleans, La.

YOUR HONORS: I have received a copy of your circular letter sent to the attorneys general of the several States inviting them to file briefs amicus curiae dealing with questions pending before the court in the St. Helena Parish school case.

I am grateful for the opportunity to present my views. However, recognizing the paucity of decisional precedent, and particularly in view of that which follows in this letter, I hope that this will be accepted in lieu of a more formal brief.

In *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U.S. 25 (1949)), the Supreme Court wrote (p. 27):

"Due process of law thus conveys neither formal nor fixed nor narrow requirements. It is the compendious expression for all those rights which the courts must enforce because they are basic to our free society. But basic rights do not become petrified as of any one time, even though, as a matter of human experience, some may not too rhetorically be called eternal verities. It is of the very nature of a free society to advance in its standards of what is deemed reasonable and right. Representing as it

does a living principle, due process is not confined within a permanent catalog of what may at a given time be deemed the limits or the essentials of fundamental rights.

"To rely on a tidy formula for the easy determination of what is a fundamental right for purposes of legal enforcement may satisfy a longing for certainty but ignores the movements of a free society. It belittles the scale of the conception of due process. The real clue to the problem confronting the judiciary in the application of the due process clause is not to ask where the line is once and for all to be drawn but to recognize that it is for the Court to draw it by the gradual and empiric process of inclusion and exclusion (*Davidson* v. *New Orleans*, 96 U.S. 97, 104). This was the Court's insight when first called upon to consider the problem; to this insight the Court has on the whole been faithful as case after case has come before it since *Davidson* v. *New Orleans* was decided."

Public education, in grade and high school at the very least, it seems to me, today demands the protection of the due process clause not alone for the well-being of our citizens of tomorrow but as an absolute essential for the preservation of our free American way of life against the onslaught of foreign ideologies.

In *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483 (1954)), the Court, in considering "public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation," wrote (pp. 492–3):

"Today, education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the Armed Forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education."

It is only 7 years ago that these words were written. The epochal events since that time have given immeasurable emphasis to the important role which public education must play in the lives of each and every one of us. The two questions posed in your letter may be novel, but the guide to their determination has been laid down by the Supreme Court and, I respectfully submit, none but an affirmative answer should be given.

I have the honor to remain,
Very respectfully yours,
LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ,
Attorney General.

AWARD OF HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE TO SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, only a few among us have known that our colleague, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, had an honorary doctor of laws degree conferred on him by Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., when the school's commencement was held May 28, 1961.

The senior Senator from Washington has given this new honor no more mention than he has his 25th anniversary in Congress.

However, I obtained a copy of the seventy-fourth annual commencement program from Gonzaga University.

On the third page is this reference to our respected colleague:

WARREN GRANT MAGNUSON, doctor of laws: The biblical "Senator in the gates of the land" has an awesome and honorific office. He may sometimes rule, as in ancient Rome and in modern Britain; he may sometimes—and with longer ranged and greater responsibility—legislate and advise and consent.

Our son WARREN GRANT MAGNUSON for 25 years has served the State of Washington and the Nation in the highest elective offices our State can confer. Without wearing the formal toga and without the mace bearers to prepare his way, he has quietly emerged as one of the most influential persons in the gates of this land. His quickness of intellect and gift of expression have made him appreciated on both sides of a body where parliamentary maneuver is a noticed art.

He has consistently concerned himself with the well-being of his country, without, however, forgetting the needs of those at home who seek his intercession. This perfect balance, expected of one whose function it is to advise and consent, merits alma mater's conferring on him this day the degree of doctor of laws.

This citation was delivered by the Very Reverend Edmund W. Morton, S.J., president, Gonzaga University, as the degree was conferred.

Being one of five outstanding individuals honored at the Gonzaga University with degrees ranging from doctor of literature to the De Smet Medal, Senator MAGNUSON made no formal remarks. Had he done so, I would ask that they be made a part of the RECORD.

It is good, Mr. President, that this honorary degree has been conferred upon Senator MAGNUSON. Actually, it could have been bestowed in many fields with equal justification.

All of us know the key role which Senator MAGNUSON has taken in advancing programs, serving our Nation better today, because they came for review before the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, or the Senate Aeronautics and Space Sciences Committee, on which he serves with distinction.

Talking with our colleague WARREN MAGNUSON, he told of the friend in the newspaper profession who had written a congratulatory letter following the award of the doctor of laws degree, noting that the Senator could put this to good use, because "many of our laws need doctoring."

But that would be a modest answer to this man whose stature rises so high in the United States which he has helped so much to further in so many ways and so unforgettably.

THE ROAD TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WALTER H. JUDD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Southern Maryland Woman's Club was recently privileged to hear Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, deliver an address on the subject, "The Road to Peace." It was described as a talk that "the parents will be proud to tell their children about in the years to come."

Representative JUDD told his audience that the road to peace begins with the recognition of the Communist conspiracy in all its subtle horror, that victory will not come about through military might alone, but that "you must win with ideas."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Times Crescent of La Plata, Md., reporting the address of Representative JUDD be printed in the RECORD.

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

DR. WALTER H. JUDD DIAGNOSES "SICK WORLD"—MINNESOTA CONGRESSMAN SPEAKS IN LA PLATA; GUEST OF WOMAN'S CLUB

The world is "sick," but not beyond all hope of recovery.

That, in summary, was the diagnosis and prognosis presented to the Southern Maryland Woman's Club by Dr. WALTER H. JUDD, U.S. Congressman from Minnesota, world traveler, medical missionary, and recognized specialist on the principal disease from which the "sick world" suffers, viz, the international Communist conspiracy.

Dr. JUDD spoke for an hour and a half to a rapt audience of more than 200 persons, at the La Plata High School auditorium Tuesday evening. The title of his talk was, "The Road to Peace."

DISTINGUISHED AREA RESIDENTS

At the conclusion of the memorable address, Isaac Don Levine, a well-known writer and authority on foreign affairs, now a resident of Charles County, called it one of the finest speeches he had been privileged to hear—one that "the parents will be proud to tell their children about in the years to come."

Mr. Levine and Hon. Maynard Barnes, former U.S. Minister to Turkey and Bulgaria and Chargé d'Affaires in Paris at the outbreak of World War II, now a St. Mary's County resident, were seated on the stage with Congressman JUDD and participated in the question-and-answer discussion that followed the main address.

Mr. Barnes introduced the distinguished speaker, following the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" and appropriate introductory remarks by Mrs. Walter Espach, program chairman.

GLOOMY PROGNOSIS

Dr. JUDD, during the wide range of his thought-provoking, fact-filled address, covered the whole spectrum of the rise of communism and decline of freedom over the past 30 years. And while his medical training prompted him to observe that miracles do happen in diseases of the human body—a new drug is discovered to effect a cure—there was an underlying feeling of despair in Dr. JUDD's speech about the ability of the free world to recover from the disease which affects its body politic.

"The letters reaching a Congressman's desk," he said, "show that there was never a time characterized by greater uneasiness. The people don't see any way out, other than an atomic holocaust."

In answer to his own questions of "How did we get into this situation? How did we miscalculate so bady?" Dr. JUDD said it resulted from "apathy and cowardice from within. We have just refused to believe that the Communists mean what they say on the subject of the worldwide revolution.

BASIS OF REVOLUTION

"When Lenin said 'there can never be peace until private ownership of property is abolished,' he meant just that."

This is the very basis of the Communist revolution. It is a war between those who own property and those who have only what they collect on Saturday night.

"The Chinese Communists are not Chinese," said Dr. JUDD; "they are world revolu-

tionists. When an American becomes a Communist he is no longer an American, he is a world revolutionist.

"We don't study this adversary," Dr. JUDD continued. "We fail to realize that he doesn't play the game according to our rules."

RECOGNITION ILL ADVISED

The speaker tied in those observations with the diplomatic recognition of Russia by the United States in 1933 and with our continuing efforts to deal at the conference table with the Communist leaders.

He said Stalin had just executed 6 to 7 million of his people when he sent Litvinov to America in 1933 to sell us on the idea that diplomatic recognition and trade with Russia would help us recover from the depression.

"Stalin's objective was political, not economic," said Dr. JUDD. "Trade between the two countries has been less since 1933 than before; but Stalin got what he wanted because we broke the back of the peasants' will to resist by recognizing him as the head of their government."

SUMMITRY FUTILE

The speaker was equally critical of summitry.

"Perhaps I shouldn't tell this," he said, "but President Eisenhower made this statement to me: 'I will travel anywhere in the cause of peace.'

"Yes," I said, "but you shouldn't go to the wrong places."

He would offer the same advice to President Kennedy in connection with his proposed Vienna meeting with Khrushchev. He is convinced that the only purpose the Communists have in such meetings is to get the free world to relax its guard so that the next blow might be more easily struck.

"The Communists don't want Cuba," the speaker continued; "they want the Western Hemisphere. They don't want Berlin; they want Europe. They don't want Vietnam; they want Asia."

Any attempt to deal with them on these matters, he said, is equivalent to the FBI calling in leading gangsters for a conference on how to cope with a crime wave that they were engaged in.

In conclusion, the Minnesota Congressman told his La Plata audience that the United States has put too much dependence on the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in this global war.

"You don't win with arms," he said; "you only hold with arms. You must win with ideas."

One idea which Dr. JUDD advanced is to organize, as he expressed it, a new club of Nations that will unite and work together in the interest of peace, based upon effective machinery for the administration of justice.

This did not mean disbanding the United Nations, he said, but the U.N. might well be superseded by such a club; just as the adoption of the Constitution and establishment of the United States of America superseded the Articles of Confederation.

SALT WATER CONVERSION PLANT DEDICATION AND PADRE ISLAND INSPECTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans are indeed proud of two important and significant events which will take place in their State tomorrow.

I refer first to the dedication ceremonies for the saline water conversion plant at Freeport, the pilot project for converting sea water into fresh water.

President Kennedy will participate in the project by a special long-distance telephone arrangement, and Vice President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Udall and Parks Director Conrad Wirth will attend the ceremonies and be principal speakers.

A number of distinguished leaders of both the Senate and House will also participate in the dedication ceremonies. Among those expected to take part are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the extremely able chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], also a leader of that distinguished committee.

Several outstanding leaders of the House of Representatives, including a number from my own State of Texas—Representatives J. T. RUTHERFORD, CLARK THOMPSON, JOHN YOUNG, BOB POAGE, JOE KILGORE, and several others—Representative DON MAGNUSON, of Washington, and MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio.

In addition to marking the opening of this vital new water conversion project, Vice President Johnson, Secretary Udall, Director Wirth and most of the other Senators and Representatives will go to Padre Island for a personal inspection tour of the proposed Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area site.

Mayor Ben McDonald, the efficient and personable leader of the city of Corpus Christi, is working with the chamber of commerce, the Coastal Bend Tourist Association, and many other groups to hold a fish fry on Padre Island honoring Secretary Udall. Right now four fishing boats are working two choice fishing banks of the Texas gulf coast, despite some squally weather, to catch the fish for the dinner. Members of the Laguna Madre Fishermen's Association are going to fry the fish and prepare the rest of the meal.

Following the fish fry, the group will make an aerial inspection the length of Padre Island, landing at Brownsville for a meeting with Cameron County Judge Oscar Dancy and other Rio Grande Valley leaders.

Mr. President, Texans in all areas of the State are pleased to welcome these governmental leaders who are interested in both of these important projects.

We look forward to giving them a Texas-size welcome and to working with them toward the completion of these two outstanding programs in the fields of water research and natural resource preservation.

I regret that arrangements have not been made for the Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF] and other distinguished Senators present to attend this affair, which will be one of the outstanding events of the year in Texas. We are glad that the Vice President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], Secretary of the Interior Udall, I believe Secretary of the Navy Connolly, and many others will be present on that flight in the morning.

DEPORTATIONS FROM THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, mid-June is the anniversary of the brutal mass deportations carried out by the Soviet Union in the three Baltic nations, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Two decades ago the brutal dictators of Soviet Russia ordered the Baltic peoples to leave their century-old homes and exiled them to distant Communist work centers or concentration camps in remote parts of the Soviet territory.

What was their crime? They believed in freedom. They had once, for a brief period, enjoyed freedom. They could not be trusted to endure the tyranny and degradation of communism. For that reason, they were forcibly driven from their homelands into a bitter Siberian exile.

Today it is unknown whether these refugees are living or dead, whether they survived the rigors of forced labor camps, of wartime captivity, and of Soviet ruthlessness. The ones that do survive, in Siberia, in other parts of Russia, or still in the Baltic nations, are often ignorant of the fate of their closest kin. Families were wrenched apart. As many as 50,000 were seized in 1 year for deportation.

In paying homage to these brave Baltic people, the people of the United States are expressing their deep conviction, their never-ceasing prayer that freedom will one day return to Eastern Europe and to the lands that nestle around the Baltic Sea. Here in America where we enjoy freedom it is only fitting to pay homage to the continuing hopes and endurance of the people behind the Iron Curtain for whom freedom does not exist today but for whom freedom remains a bright dream that will never be forgotten.

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW YORK STATE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in order that the Congress may be advised of the position of two key groups in New York State on issues of national importance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution of the Tompkins County Bar Association in support of H.R. 10 and a copy of a resolution of the Medical Society of the State of New York urging the acceleration of drug inspection services to safeguard the public health.

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

RESOLUTION BY TOMPKINS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, ITHACA, N.Y.

Resolved, That the Tompkins County (N.Y.) Bar Association recognizes the need for the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals with appropriate legislative provisions for tax deduction of employer's contribution, and, to this end, recommends the adoption of the self-employed individuals tax retirement bill of 1961 now before Congress (H.R. 10).

RESOLUTION BY MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Whereas a special National Academy of Sciences Committee advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, composed of C. Phillip Miller, M.D., professor of medicine, University of Chicago, Chairman; John H. Dingle, M.D., professor of preventive medicine, Western Reserve University; Maxwell Finland, M.D., associate professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School; Colin M. MacLeod, M.D., professor of medicine, New York University; Karl F. Mayer,

M.D., director emeritus, George Williams Hooper Foundation, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco; John R. Paul, M.D., professor of preventive medicine, Yale University; Carl F. Schmidt, M.D., professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania; and Wesley W. Spink, M.D., professor of medicine, University of Minnesota, has reviewed the policies and procedures of the Food and Drug Administration concerning the acceptance and certification of new drugs; and

Whereas this Committee has recommended:

(a) That the Food and Drug Administration be authorized to carry on continuous inspection of drug manufacturing facilities and drug products to guarantee compliance with quality standards before marketing; and

(b) That several other procedures be instituted with the purpose of safeguarding the public health with regard to drug therapy; and

Whereas, the Medical Society of the State of New York believes that these recommendations are sound and urgent: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Medical Society of the State of New York endorse these recommendations and urge that the Congress of the United States adopt legislation to enact them into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegates of the Medical Society of the State of New York to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association be instructed to introduce this resolution into the house of delegates of the American Medical Association in June 1961.

WILLIAM L. WHEELER, Jr., M.D.,
Secretary.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on June 15, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered an address before the Eighth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, which was held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington. I was privileged to hear Secretary Rusk's address, and I considered it to be one of the most effective explanations of the foreign aid program, its purposes, and the means by which it would be implemented that I have ever heard.

I think the address was particularly remarkable in that it was a completely off-the-cuff response to the audience on this important subject. I invite the attention of Senators particularly to two paragraphs of the address:

When a new administration comes in, it is a suitable occasion for a serious and critical review of such a 15-year experience; indeed, it is a necessary occasion. * * * This review should include an examination of our successes to try to understand how they came about, to find those elements of success which might be transferred to other situations—the innovations, individuals, ideas, and institutional structures and procedures which might be drawn from one success to build another somewhere else. We should also look at some of our disappointments to find out whether they were caused by action or inaction on our part or whether they resulted from forces beyond our control, and to see to what extent we can protect ourselves against such disappointments in the future.

How can we make our investments better investments? How can we increase their yield? How can we make a dollar go further? We must try to teach the public good administration by practicing it ourselves. We must find out how we can act more speedily, more effectively, more perceptively, more relevantly as we go about this business of aid.

I suggest that the quotations I have read from Secretary Rusk's address should constitute assurance to the taxpayers of our country that this administration, in approaching the whole problem of foreign aid, is doing so soundly and constructively.

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

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE EIGHTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 15, 1961

Mr. Taft, distinguished Members of the Senate, of the House of Representatives, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate your invitation to be here this evening, although I must say that I am somewhat reluctant to proceed after the moving statements which you have already had before you.

I must confess to mixed feelings as I find myself on this particular spot this evening, after having sat at more comfortable tables, for most of your previous annual meetings. I shall not attempt to compete with the galaxy of experts on your programs, but rather to make some brief and quite informal personal remarks about my own reactions to the foreign aid issues now before the Nation.

Let me say that we are deeply grateful for your presence and for your demonstrated interest in economic and social development beyond our borders. It is sometimes said that foreign aid has no natural constituency in the United States. I think this is wrong, even though the constituency is not highly organized and not always as vocal as some of those who oppose it. This conference itself—bipartisan, nonpartisan, much of it nonpolitical—is broadly representative, and the voices here deserve attention and respect.

But the solid support of the participating organizations and of those individuals who have made this conference possible is itself a public service of the highest order.

The main constituents of foreign aid, as I see it, are those Americans who by the tens of millions have shown their readiness to do what has to be done to build a decent world order, who have carried on the traditional reputation of the American people for concern about misery and want, both at home and abroad, and who have made a deep commitment in their own personal lives to the survival and growth of freedom.

We would make a great mistake in the midst of our political debates were we to underestimate the American people at this sobering moment in our national history—underestimate their mixture of idealism and practicality, their mixture of impatient energy and determined resistance—for I believe the American people know that the stakes in foreign aid involve every home and every community across the land. I am also convinced that our foreign aid programs are the principal instruments we have to support the vital interests of the American people in a peaceful way.

I wish it were possible for every county courthouse to show a map of the world with pins on it showing where the men and women of that county have served in the defense of freedom in the last 20 years, and a map of the county itself showing the homes of those who have made sacrifices in this great struggle for freedom. For the issues of this struggle reach us all in the remotest corners of the land wherever we go about our business.

There is a phrase around Washington these days that foreign aid is in trouble. You have heard it; you will hear it again. I hope I am right in understanding what that phrase means and what it does not mean. For as we move into the consideration of our aid programs for another year, we cannot help but be conscious of the fact—and it has been mentioned here in your conference—that we can now look back upon some 15 years of experience in postwar foreign aid—those emergency days of immediate postwar relief, those necessary days of aid to Greece and Turkey, those challenging days of the Marshall plan, the inspiriting idea of the point 4 program, the initiation of development loans and grants, the use of agricultural surpluses for assistance abroad.

It would be natural and right if we as a nation should pause and look back over those 15 years of experience. Let's start with you yourself in this conference. As I have sat at one or another of these tables in past years as a constituent of foreign aid, I have found myself hoping a little anxiously that those who were proposing the program would give us something to support; those who are committed to foreign aid cannot help but want to know whether the best job possible is being done, whether the right questions are being asked, whether the resources are being put to the best advantage.

When a new administration comes in, it is a suitable occasion for a serious and critical review of such a 15-year experience; indeed, it is a necessary occasion. President Kennedy has himself led the way in looking deeply into this bipartisan experience in the postwar period to see what can be learned from it which will help us in the years ahead, as well as to reexamine the character and the purpose of foreign aid. This review should include an examination of our successes to try to understand how they came about, to find those elements of success which might be transferred to other situations—the innovations, individuals, ideas, and institutional structures and procedures which might be drawn from one success to build another somewhere else. We should also look at some of our disappointments to find out whether they were caused by action or inaction on our part or whether they resulted from forces beyond our control, and to see to what extent we can protect ourselves against such disappointments in the future.

How can we make our investments better investments? How can we increase their yield? How can we make a dollar go further? We must try to teach the public good administration by practicing it ourselves. We must find out how we can act more speedily, more effectively, more perceptively, more relevantly as we go about this business of aid. We must learn to share these burdens with those who are ready, willing, and able to share them. We and other advanced countries must act more effectively together, must join public and private effort in a more effective common campaign and must deal intelligently with questions of priorities.

If resources are scarce, the more important, the more urgent, the more enduring must come first. In addition to the administration's searching—a searching which is still going on—the Congress, too, is giving the aid program a rigorous review. No one knows that better than those of us who have recently been witnesses before congressional committees. It is right that they should make this review, not merely because it is their constitutional duty, but also because when you look back over these last 15 years,

you will find on the congressional committees an accumulation—indeed, a wealth—of responsible experience which would be hard to match anywhere in the country.

One can sympathize with the remark of the distinguished Senator who referred to all the "revolving experts who have paraded before us down through the years." For these representatives of the people have had to accept their own responsibilities in the development of most of our aid programs since World War II. They have struggled with the national policy involved; they have studied the situations to which aid is applied. Many of them have visited programs in the field, and they have acquired much knowledge to contribute to these programs. The programs will be better for having been thoroughly examined and criticized in this process.

That we must do a better job in foreign aid, no one can seriously deny. But if we say that foreign aid is in trouble and mean by that that we as a nation are unwilling to make a serious effort on the scale now proposed to Congress—roughly 1 percent of our gross national product—then, we have cause for deep concern; for that would mean that we citizens are in trouble, that the free world is in trouble, that the future of this Republic is in trouble.

Do we, each one of us, occasionally have isolationist nostalgia? Perhaps so, but there are no isolationists in the Kremlin. Are we preoccupied, as understandably we might be, with our own great unfinished tasks here at home in our schools, in our unemployment, in our health, in the care of our aged?

The Red Chinese are pressing their programs abroad in the face of desperate and widespread hunger at home, making large demands upon their slender resources of foreign exchange. Can we imagine that we can be secure while others are living at the edge of terror, or that we can be prosperous if others are in misery? Are we worried about costs, and have we thought of the costs of war?

We are approaching our aid effort this year in an attempt to find the right answers to a number of the questions which have been actively discussed here in this conference. We are looking genuinely for simplified administration, for responsibility which runs from the group in the country involved under the leadership of the Ambassador through a regional assistant administrator to the Administrator. We are looking for an organization which can be expected to make timely decisions when resources can be used to the best advantage, to delay only when delay is intentional, and to put responsibility upon identifiable individuals.

We hope to gear our assistance programs to the special situation in each country. For, looking back over the last 15 years, I think it is becoming more and more apparent that each country is unique in its situation. One country may be moving by historical accident to independent nationhood with limited natural resources, with relatively underdeveloped talents, with limited administrative apparatus, but with a people who are sharing fully all of the revolution of rising expectations.

Another may have reached a higher stage of development and be ready for longer range planning and for major capital investment if such can be mobilized both internally and in external financial markets. Others may be attempting gallantly to get on with their development, but may be subject to direct penetration, terrorism and subversion by those who would strike down development by violence in the very heart of the society itself.

But in each country these things can be studied under the leadership of an Ambassador who must turn now more and more to what Eugene Black, Director of the World Bank, has called development diplomacy. Each country must try to put together the types of arrangements which will bind into a general national program the various elements of aid which might be available through a consortium, through multilateral agencies, through private organizations, but most of all through self-help.

We hope to be able to take a longer range look at development, to recognize that development is not just a dam here or a factory there or a road over here, but that development requires advance on a broad front and that development takes time—that first things have to be done first. One of the first of these is the development of human talent.

But in doing so, we must not make what might be a fatal mistake. I have mentioned it before, and I expect to mention it more than once again. We in the West have tended to say that development obviously takes a long time. Look at us. It took two or three centuries for us to get where we are following our industrial revolution. But we cannot concede this point to totalitarianism, nor need we do so. For the rate of development which has occurred in the Western world—in the free world—since 1917 has been breathtaking. It has transformed the lives of the peoples of the West. Science, knowledge, and technology can be transferred. Indeed, that has explained a good deal of the rapid development of the Soviet Union.

People in the so-called underdeveloped countries are not sentenced to two centuries of development. There are the means at hand to move promptly, to build with satisfying speed if they and we and other free peoples can help them do so—and do so under free institutions.

We are consulting closely with our friends to work out modes of partnership in aid programs through the OECD and the Development Assistance Committee, which is to become the new agency of OECD for that purpose. We are looking with our friends for some division of labor so that each can concentrate his efforts where they will be most effective.

We are concerned about the knowledge needed for development. Indeed, one of the most interesting parts of the new aid program is provision for research on these matters, not just the technical and scientific research needed to answer specific programs such as bilharziasis in Egypt or the problem of particular food crops adjusted to unusual climatic conditions of heredity of salic soils or whatever it might be—but knowledge about the processes of change.

How do you get people to accept promptly a new variety of bean, shall we say, which produces four times the yield of the accustomed variety if the bean turns out to be the wrong color and of a somewhat different taste? How do you get people to change social habits to take prompt advantage of the opportunities for public health? There are many elements here about which we know much too little.

We expect to give a great deal of attention to talent—the talent of those who extend aid as well as of those who receive. For in most situations, it would not be hazardous to say that the genuine bottleneck in development is perhaps not money, but people—people with the training, professional capacity, leadership and motivation to take charge of development processes and to lead nations in their development effort.

Our own search for talent here in this country will continue. I would like to comment—this has of course been done before—on some of the caricatures that have been made about people in our aid programs overseas. There is no question but that we have had some misfits. There is no question but that all those who have gone abroad have not made a success of their efforts. For they, too, are people, and people are just that way. But there is great dedication, great capacity, and great gallantry in the experience of those who have served this country in our foreign aid programs in all parts of the world.

I am thinking, too, of the wives of those who have gone abroad to serve, committed to bringing up children under difficult health hazards, or to finding an adequate way to educate their children so that they can take their place again in the educational life of our own country upon returning home. We shall continue to need talent of the highest order. The combination of professional capacity and willingness to serve is still scarce in our society and talent hunts shall go on and on.

There will be adjustments in our aid programs flowing from some of the concepts we have been talking about. One of the most important adjustments is a new emphasis on the need for mobilizing peoples in their own development. For here is where self-help is important. We have learned in our own society, we have learned from experience elsewhere, that economic and social development cannot come from outside one's own border, that it requires a people on the move, and also interested, dedicated, committed, alert, ambitious, energetic effort on the part of the people themselves.

The premiums go to those leaders who know how to mobilize that dedication, take advantage of this upsurge of interest and demand and transform it into a spirit of achievement and hope throughout the society. Some of these adjustments in our program will of course take time. We cannot dart in and out of situations on a moment's notice. Aid programs involve other governments and other peoples, and changes require careful and sometimes lengthy negotiations. Education, persuasion, and preparation will be necessary, and some of the changes will not and cannot be apparent for some time to come.

I would urge, Mr. Taft, that members of the conference consider going back to their constituencies with certain central ideas in mind. In response to questioning—public questioning, congressional questioning, administrative questioning—we shall try to register our determination to do the best possible job with the resources which are entrusted to us. This is something which we cannot prove overnight, but the determination is there.

I hope you can go back with a sense of exhilaration of what is happening to peoples' lives as a result of our help. Many of you have visited programs conducted by voluntary and private organizations or by the United Nations. Some of you have been in villages in so-called backward countries which are already far more advanced scientifically and technically and in social terms than were the farms on which you and I grew up.

Some of you may have visited the great medical center now being built in New Delhi which was started by a million pound grant from New Zealand under the Colombo plan, to which the Government of India contributed its own resources, and which ICA and private agencies also supported. This center of teaching and research may well match the best of our medical institutions in the Western World.

You may have visited community development programs where villages themselves have taken charge of their own affairs, building schools, developing sanitation, and improving crops. Or you may have seen something of the tens of thousands of men and women who have been trained under these programs and who are back at their posts and getting on with the world's work more effectively as a result. These things are hard to measure in dollar terms, but one

is deeply reassured when he sees them at first hand.

I should like also to mention the fundamental issues which are involved in our readiness to go ahead with foreign aid. We cannot afford to be weary; we cannot afford to say we have done enough. If each of us could have been in Vienna to hear Mr. Khrushchev talk about the kind of world he sees coming into being, foreign aid would not be in trouble in the United States. For the nature of the struggle in the world is such that it makes some of our problems here a home appear insignificant.

It sometimes seems remarkable that with this deadly struggle in process, we tear ourselves to pieces here at home while deciding what we are to do. Yet, when one stands back and looks at the somewhat boisterous process of democracy, one would not wish it to be otherwise.

I hope you can take back with you some of the quiet assurance which comes from comradeship with men and women all over the world in these joint undertakings. Mr. Khrushchev uses the word "peace," the word "democracy," the words "the people," and thereby pays tribute to the power of some of the great central ideas of the human race. In that sense, he is a hobo catching a free ride on others' ideas.

One thing that has been deeply impressive to me is to see in how many directions and in how many ways the American people have stretched out their hands to establish ties with men and women all over the earth with whom they share common purposes. We find few who would rather be hungry than fed, or ignorant than informed, or naked than clothed. We find few men and women who do not believe in the worth of individual dignity, peace, and justice.

These are the people with whom we are in partnership in quiet ways, whether in universities or in rice paddies, whether in great enginering projects or in home economics demonstrations in distant villages. I think there is no distortion of any serious import in this part of our activity.

Let people understand through these associations what America is all about. I think they have confidence in that kind of America because that is America at its best.

Thank you very much.

JAMES A. FARLEY, COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President. James A. Farley, Postmaster General under President Roosevelt, is known to all Americans as an astute political leader. He is also an elder statesman of the Democratic Party.

A few days ago Mr. Farley delivered a commencement day address in San Antonio, Tex. We are indebted to the New York Journal-American for publishing some brief excerpts from that speech.

Because of Mr. Farley's acknowledged eminence in and many contributions to the Democratic Party, I hope that President Kennedy and his foreign policy advisers will carefully study Mr. Farley's speech, particularly that section dealing with certain eternal principles. I quote:

Let us stand by our principles though the heavens fall. No man and no nation ever compromises an eternal principle; they only succeed in compromising themselves.

Appeasement will not work. Baldwin, blindfolding himself, did not stop the buildup of Nazi forces which swept over Europe. Chamberlain's appeasement umbrella did not stop the rain of bombs on British cities.

Dictators, brown, red, or black, are stopped by minutemen, not "rabbitmen."

Because of the timeliness and high patriotic order of Mr. Farley's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Journal-American, June 18, 1961]

APPEASEMENT IS ROAD TO WAR

(By James A. Farley)

The very soul of Western civilization is under devastating attack today. It is a great temptation to gloss over the fact, to bestow upon the black cloud of communism a fictitious silver lining, at least for your commencement day.

To me, however, that would be close to spiritual treason, because I believe that the first disagreeable task we must face is that communism intends to destroy us, and has come very far on the road to accomplishment.

Fifteen countries have been imprisoned, hundreds of millions of people have been enslaved, and still the Red tide sweeps onward. Let us not pay tribute to the enemy's zeal; that is only half the story of his success. The other half we have contributed through our folly, our childlike ineptitude and our forthright appeasement.

TWENTY MINUTES OFFSHORE

What possible explanation is there for the fact that Communist forces are within 20 minutes striking distance of our Florida cities?

What crevice in our armor does Mr. Khrushchev believe he has perceived that makes him think he can penetrate the Western Hemisphere now? The answer, it seems to me, is crystal clear. He relies not on his strength but on our folly; not on his striking force but on our befuddled breast-beaters—those who apologize for the American civilization—instead of upholding it.

If fear of atomic war is great in the West it must be equally great in Moscow. They (Communists) intimidate our timid by threatening that of which they have every reason to be more terrified than we.

Let us stand by our principles though the heavens fall. No man and no nation ever compromises an eternal principle; they only succeed in compromising themselves.

Appeasement will not work. Baldwin, blindfolding himself, did not stop the buildup of the Nazi forces which swept over Europe. Chamberlain's appeasement umbrella did not stop the rain of bombs on British cities.

Dictators, Brown, Red or Black, are stopped by Minute Men, not Rabbit Men.

PUSHED OFF EARTH?

I feel that to yield further to them (Communists) is to add to their delusion that they can, in the end, pressure the West off the earth without war.

It is my conviction that should President Kennedy elect to order the Armed Forces of the United States into action against Communist Castro his action would be hailed by the free governments and the free peoples of the world. In these times of agonizing decision, their prayers are already with him.

Furthermore, even more important than the preservation of the Western Hemisphere, the avoidance of global war may well depend upon giving unmistakable evidence to the Kremlin that to the extent it believes itself on the road to world conquest it is in fact on the road to global war.

I should be less than frank if I did not say that I, as an American, am appalled more at our appeasers than I am intimidated by the Communists.

I count it ignominious for any American statesman to indicate that he believes we must have good moral reasons for intervention in Cuba when, in my opinion, we are hard put to it to find good moral reasons for failure to intervene at once.

CEDING OF POLISH TERRITORY TO RUSSIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was much interested in reading in the Evening Star of Monday, June 19, a column written by David Lawrence entitled "A Summit Secret After 17 Years."

The content of this column, based upon the recent release of State Department papers on World War II conferences between the Allied Powers, is indeed shocking, and bears out repeated warnings by me and others against our Government entering into secret agreements which should, under the Constitution of the United States, be considered by the U.S. Senate.

This revelation must come as a very depressing one to the millions of American citizens of Polish descent who have prided themselves in their fight to suppress territorial expansion on the part of foreign powers.

The American people and the U.S. Congress are entitled to know and should be given the full disclosure of all agreements entered into by our Government during and after World War II. For the benefit of those who have not read this astounding revelation, I ask unanimous consent that the David Lawrence article be made a part of my remarks.

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

A SUMMIT SECRET AFTER 17 YEARS—ROOSEVELT REMARKS TO STALIN LINKING POLISH BORDER, POLITICS HELD SHAMEFUL

(By David Lawrence)

A shameful chapter in American history now has been revealed after 17 years of secrecy. Documents just published by the State Department show that a President of the United States went to a summit conference during World War II and made a deal with the Communist leader—Josef Stalin—whereby much of Poland's territory was deliberately conceded to Russia and the way was paved for similar deals that permitted the Communists to grab small countries.

What was even worse, a President of the United States told a foreign ruler that his own decisions were related to a fear he might not retain a bloc of votes of American citizens of Polish extraction and that, for this reason, the deal had to be kept secret—at least until a Presidential election was over. Actually, these facts were not disclosed until now.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Democrat, was the President of the United States who participated in these secret negotiations in 1943 at Teheran, Iran. He disregarded the rule of the Constitution which says that the Chief Executive "shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

It is out of this clause in the Constitution that a President derives his power to conduct foreign policy. The right to make temporary agreements or understandings directly related to the military conduct of a war has never been questioned, but any pact which is as far reaching as a division of territory after a war certainly comes with-

in the category of a treaty. The Senate should have been consulted.

The carving up of territory—utterly disregarding the wishes of the people and their future opportunities for self-government—is something associated usually with the absolute monarch. A President of the United States is supposed to be the champion of freedom and of the self-determination of peoples. The Polish people didn't start World War II. On the contrary, it was Hitler's attack on Poland that drew Britain into the conflict. Yet President Roosevelt was later a party to the partitioning of Poland so as to satisfy Communist Russia, which had seized a large part of Poland in 1939 while a partner of Hitler.

It might be asked why a Democratic administration in Washington today makes public hitherto undisclosed documents that reflect so gravely on the conduct of foreign policy by a previous Democratic administration. The reason may be inferred from an Associated Press dispatch of February 17 last quoting from an exclusive story in the New York Daily News which stated that President Eisenhower, on leaving the White House, took with him proof sheets of the papers on the Teheran Conference. The article said that Republican leaders, who had conferred with Mr. Eisenhower, asked him to keep a copy of the papers indefinitely to see whether they would be withheld or released in part by the State Department. So apparently the Kennedy administration had no choice but to give them in full of the press.

Much of the Teheran story has been told over the years, but never have the American people learned the details of the secret deal between President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin. It so happens that Charles E. Bohlen, who at the time was First Secretary of the American Embassy in Moscow and acted as interpreter for Mr. Roosevelt, accompanied President Kennedy at his recent conference in Vienna with Nikita Khrushchev.

The State Department's published record—based on Mr. Bohlen's extensive notes—now shows Mr. Roosevelt discussing the Polish question in a private talk with Marshal Stalin on December 1, 1943, as follows:

"The President said he had asked Marshal Stalin to come to see him as he wished to discuss a matter briefly and frankly. He said it referred to internal American politics. He said that we had an election in 1944 and that while personally he did not wish to run again, if the war was still in progress he might have to. He added that there were in the United States from 6 to 7 million Americans of Polish extraction, and as a practical man, he did not wish to lose their vote.

"He (the President) said personally he agreed with the views of Marshal Stalin as to the necessity of the restoration of a Polish state but would like to see the eastern border moved further to the west and the western border moved even to the River Oder. He hoped, however, that the Marshal would understand that for political reasons outlined above, he could not participate in any decision here in Teheran or even next winter on this subject and that he could not publicly take part in any such arrangement at the present time.

"Marshal Stalin replied that now the President explained, he had understood.

"The President went on to say that there were a number of persons of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian origin, in that order, in the United States. He said that he fully realized the three Baltic Republics had in history and again more recently been a part of Russia and added jokingly that when the Soviet armies reoccupied these areas, he did not intend to go to war with the Soviet Union on this point."

Thus did an American President lend his power and influence to the formation of the present bloc of satellite states in Eastern Europe. Recently some enthusiastic admirers of President Kennedy have been saying that he is "very much like Franklin D. Roosevelt." One wonders whether, after Mr. Kennedy's secret conference alone with Nikita Khrushchev in Vienna, the comparison will some day be pressed by Republicans instead of by Democrats.

OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA AND OTHER BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last week Americans of Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian descent observed the anniversary of the tragic occupation of these free and independent nations by the relentless armies of Red Russia.

It was during 1940–41 that the Soviet conducted mass deportations of citizens from these three occupied countries and exiled them to the slave labor camps of Soviet Russia.

Now, more than 20 years later, these nations still lie prostrate under the military power of the Soviet and those who remained in the homeland are deprived of their natural rights and the fundamentals of a free people.

Mr. President, I join with all Americans and those who love freedom throughout the world, in recalling to mind these tragic nations and pray that in due time deliverance from the hand of the captor will come. In the meanwhile, they can be assured they are not forgotten and that our hopes and prayers join with theirs in the cause of liberty and national free sovereignty.

NINTH ANNUAL STUDENTS COMPOSERS AWARDS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the State of Ohio is very proud of the selection of Arthur Murphy, 64 Spring Street, Oberlin, Ohio, by Broadcast Music, Inc., as a recipient of a cash award in its Ninth Annual Student Composers Awards.

The Ohio winner is only 19 and is studying at the Juilliard School of Music. Mr. Murphy's award was based on three original entries in the annual composers contest. These compositions included "The Innocence" for chorus and four instruments; "Bebeke Quartet" for strings; and "Prelude to Death After Rain" for orchestra.

It is most encouraging that these young people are being inspired and assisted by established music organizations.

It is my sincere hope that the art of music will receive a new impetus through the young composers of the United States.

USE OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 21, the Senate passed S. 205, relating to the educational use of television facilities. The measure is now awaiting action in the House of Representatives.

On June 3, I received from the superintendent of public instruction of my State of Oregon, a most informative, detailed letter relating to the use of educational television which Oregon hopes to make, if S. 205 becomes law. With the hope that this letter will be informative and helpful to Members of the other body, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Minear's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., May 31, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Oregon State Department of Education is interested in the passage of Senate bill 205. After a decade of developments in the field of educational television, the schoolchildren of this State are not yet being provided with any widespread access to this new communication medium. As yet, there has not been a single educational television channel activated in this State by a local school district or combination of school districts, by a local community organization, or association of private schools or colleges, or by any other combination of educational and cultural interests. The only access to educational television, and especially in-school viewing of planned educational broadcasts, has been provided in 1957 to a limited area of western Oregon by KOAC–TV channel 7, Corvallis, and since January 1961 by KOAP–TV channel 10, Portland, both stations being operated as an educational television network by the General Extension Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. So far as programs for in-school viewing for elementary and secondary schools of the State are concerned, the nearly 400,000 Oregon schoolchildren have had only 2 hours per week of programing during the past year and almost nothing prior to that time.

Lest this seem a reflection upon the concern of Oregon citizens for their children's educational opportunities, it should be pointed out that there has been no dearth of interest in educational television on the part of many groups both in professional education and among lay people. The simple truth is that Oregon's pattern of population distribution and geographical conformation does not now and will not in the foreseeable future provide the concentrated density which can afford educational television facilities on the basis of local areas. For example, outside of the Portland area there is not a single metropolitan region which can boast of more than 100,000 persons and not a single incorporated city of more than 60,000. The largest of these—Eugene and Salem—count their populations somewhere in the 40,000's. Thus, it is not within the realm of possibility for these limited population complexes, whether they work through local school districts, other official agencies, or voluntary organizations representing cultural groups of the community, to support educational television facilities. The school districts of each of these areas have an attendance of less than 13,000 pupils daily, which indicates how frail the base is for local educational television installation. Only the Portland school district of Multnomah County with its approximately 75,000 pupil enrollment could hope to do so, and then apparently only with some outside assistance.

For the rest of Oregon, the population is widely distributed and Oregon's elementary and secondary school pupils are to be found in numerous small cities, towns, villages, and the rural countryside. In eastern Oregon, particularly, there are many sparsely settled and somewhat inaccessible regions for which there is no present prospect to provide educational television opportunities through local action.

It is the considered opinion of the Oregon State Department of Education that not only the best, but the only, avenue for providing educational television for in-school viewing programs is through strengthening and extending the educational television network now operated by the State system of higher education. This network as it now exists, comprising stations in Corvallis and Portland tied together with a microwave relay, is able to reach approximately 70 percent of the people of Oregon. However, for reasonable effectiveness it needs funds such as S. 205 provides for extensive improvement of broadcasting installations and equipment. Chief among these are the relocation of channel 7 transmission facilities on Mary's Peak at Corvallis in order to vastly increase the range and power, and the construction of a broadcast studio in Portland where at the present time there are no studio facilities.

Also, funds from S. 205 would permit the installation of a series of microwave relays connecting with satellite stations or translators which could extend the present network into corners of the State not now reached, including all of eastern Oregon. These pockets of population which need to be reached in order to create a complete State network include northern and southern regions of the coast, southern Oregon, and the several population concentrations of Oregon east of the mountains. This situation, of course, is a direct result of our population distribution and geographic problems. Once these facilities are installed, it would be entirely feasible for local communities, school districts, and cultural agencies to combine in providing the operating funds which, when utilized through the one network, could support a very rich educational program with a number of strategically located studios permitting regionally if not locally originated programs, and bring the benefits of cooperatively created effort as well as stimulating instructional and enrichment materials to school districts and localities of all sizes.

Therefore, the educational television network in Oregon, extended as indicated through the assistance of funds provided by S. 205, becomes the key to providing educational television opportunities, both for adult education and cultural needs and for daytime in-school viewing by the elementary and secondary schoolchildren.

In addition, funds made available by S. 205 for closed-circuit installations could be provided to a number of larger school districts which are ready to utilize this kind of ETV for improvement of instruction and in-service education for teachers within their own district boundaries. Experimentation is indicating the values of closed-circuit ETV to medium-sized school districts for accomplishing some educational goals now beyond their grasp. No Oregon school district at the present time has installed closed-circuit television, but many school districts are interested, costs being the dampering factor. Assistance through this bill would undoubtedly bring many such installations into operation and provide the opportunity to utilize and extend a number of new methods and media of instruction in Oregon public schools.

The evidence now is that it will take substantial funds to place this program into operation. The department hopes that the time will not be unduly delayed when this can be realized. The State of Oregon has already contributed what it has felt it could to the development of educational television in this State. The additional funds through S. 205 would make constructive use of educational television in Oregon a reality.

LEON P. MINEAR,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently there has come to my attention a series of articles which have appeared in a television magazine called Prevue, circulated in the Metropolitan Portland area of my State. These articles are by Jack De Ment, and relate to civil defense. They are an excellent summary of the many ways in which war can be waged against a civilian population, and include some suggestions as to what form practical civil defense should take.

I ask unanimous consent to have these three articles printed in the RECORD.

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

PROJECT CIVICARE

(By Jack De Ment)

Is civil defense an idiot in the closet, about which you'd rather not think? Is it half-baked pap, giving you false and deadly reassurance, stultifying and warping your views of the hard facts of life in the sixties? Is CD in step with reality? Do you know whether it's geared to modern warfare? Is insurance on your life worth less than 25 cents a year? Do you, in all frankness and honesty, believe that current CD should be junked? Or do you recognize that it will be valuable once it's given a real shot in the arm?

These and similar views recently jelled in the city of Portland, when Commissioner Stanley M. Earl forthrightly and realistically spoke out in your behalf about your sick civil defense. Mr. Earl's down-to-earth appraisal was long overdue, and is well taken in these very perilous times.

Commissioner Earl's stand was a result of OPAL 61, an exercise in CD, in which he refused to take part. By so doing, Mr. Earl dramatized just how feeble the patient, CD, actually is. Earl's stand was largely backed by editorials and letters to the editors of Portland's newspapers—the Oregonian, the Oregon Journal, and the Portland Reporter—with the exception of going so far as to scrap civil defense entirely.

Do you know why CD is a flyweight in a heavyweight contest? Do you assume that an attack will be with atomic and hydrogen bombs only? Do you think that delivery will be by plane or missile only? Do you believe you'll have plenty of warning—time enough for you and yours to jump into the family jalopy and drive away without getting hurt? Have you thought much about mass evacuation? And whether it will work? Do you have a shelter in your basement, and if you don't, where's your nearest shelter? If you have a shelter, do you really think it's good enough? Have you trained in CD procedures and first aid? Can you explain conelrad? Do you know the difference between the steady wail of a siren, and a wavering tone or series of short blasts?

Have you ever asked yourself: "How would I stand up under an actual attack alert—or—outright attack?" Would you panic before, during, or after attack?

All of this is intensely personal and vital to you and your family—and it's not meant to scare you, just make you think and act. Take panic and forewarning: Do you know of the studies of recent years, notably by the Committee on Disaster Studies of the National Research Council, which tell you: "In no sense can it be concluded that the availability of disaster warning information would necessarily result in the desired behavior and the desired saving of life and property"?

Do you know what CEBAR means? To the military man it's chemical, biological, atomic, and radiological warfare. But to you it can stand for death and disaster—unless you and civil defense are properly prepared. Let's glimpse at CEBAR.

Excepting atomic weapons, CEBAR weapons have one thing in common: they're not physically destructive, except to life—and that makes them tools of choice for many targets. In most cases they are cheap, can be made and used on a vast scale, often surreptitiously—as when a nation declares "a state of war" but doesn't declare "outright war" against a named enemy.

Chemical agents—poison gas—the "humane weapon" of World War I, are now sophisticated and deadly "nerve gases." A whiff or two results in convulsions and death within a few minutes if an antidote isn't given.

Biological warfare—"BW"—throws disease germs and viruses at plants and animals—and you. Food poisoning (botulinus) is a favored example (though militarily not a good one): its toxin is so potent that one expert figured that a cubic inch of the stuff could wipe out the entire world's population if handed out evenly.

Radiological warfare—"RW"—came before fallout and like fallout, relies upon the maiming and killing properties of radioactive materials. A city properly doped with the stuff is made uninhabitable. Your "nuclear neurosis"—morbid fear of radioactivity—can prop the punch of RW.

World war III has already begun—so say many people who should know—but it hasn't yet reached the "hot stage." It could at any time in a surprise attack from CEBAR weapons. If this makes you shudder, it's fully understandable—though, like death and taxes, this is one of the hard facts of life we're to face and live with.

How should we "live with it? A large part of the answer is with you. Another part is with a thoroughly revamped and beefed-up civil defense. Both are important—one can't get along without the other.

First, let's look into the poor state of affairs with CD. The reasons are many; probably you and many of those who represent you, have had a hand in it: public apathy and indifference; an unrealistic outlook, a refusal to face up to modern weapons technology; a head-in-the-sand attitude about what is coming up by way of new weapons; lack of money (CD people like Jack Lowe, as well as many volunteers—not do-gooders—have the frustrating and perhaps heartbreaking half-done job of limping along on less than 25 cents a year for each of you who is to be protected); buck passing, dilly-dallying by many legislators; confusion caused—intentionally or unintentionally—by certain "peace" and "ban the bomb" groups; and others, ad infinitum and ad nauseam.

Not well and not good, you say? You are right. At the same time you'll also say, what will we do about it? Junk civil defense or revamp civil defense? Junking CD won't do any good—and will do harm—for basically there are good qualities in CD. Revamp CD? Only if horse-and-buggy and World War II "think pieces" are larded off.

With fresh views of the problem, the facts of life help in getting a healthy, vigorous, and flexible civil defense program going for you—again, only with your cooperation. Among the facts of life are: you'll have to assume the worst and be able to act accordingly; you probably will have no warning whatsoever; you are not always going to be able to evacuate or get to a shelter (though evacuation and shelters certainly have their place); and * * *

You will have to help yourself as well as be helped—namely, keep your wits and act as you've been taught, then survive because of a revitalized civil defense.

This isn't "money-and-mouth disease"; I have a proposal to make—which I call Proj-

ect Civicare—which, when put into action will answer many problems—though, by no means, is it a cure-all. Project Civicare will have one or more of the following to offer to you, your family, your friends, your community, and your country: (1) It will save lives, quite possibly your own; (2) it will teach—and constantly remind—each of us of our obligations and responsibilities in facing up to survival head on; (3) it will be excellent in peacetime disaster—and equally good in war; (4) it will give civil defense a completely new face-lifting job, and boost its stock; (5) it will boost your interest and morale—as regards your survival; (6) it will reinforce and complement the evacuation-shelter approach to CD without compromising it; (7) it will not be inordinately expensive; (8) it will be a permanent asset and investment for each person and his community; (9) it will be flexible and dynamic, easily up-dated to weapons and warfare changes; (10) it will provide an entire new series of industries which, in turn, will give jobs and create demand for services and products; (11) it will not be a flash-in-the-pan affair—but definitely lasting for some years to come; (12) it will give an "out" for "special publics" now "on the hook," not wasting, but focusing, the talents and energies of many people against threats to your survival.

This is not the end: Project Civicare will be described in detail in coming issues of TV Prevue, so that each and every person in the atomic-aerospace age will know and understand it.

Meanwhile, "it's 2 minutes till midnight * * *."

"CIVICARE" IS "CIVILIAN CARE"

(Pt. 2 on Project Civicare)

(By Dr. Jack De Ment)

When you cut yourself, do you just stand there and bleed? Of course not. You make tracks for the medicine chest, where you keep your first aid supplies. You don't make a mad dash to get away, nor do you stand around and wait for someone to happen along.

Simply knowing there's a medicine chest handy sets your mind at ease, helps you face the crisis when it comes. In short, you've taken adequate preparations against injury—which, of course, you try to avoid—but realize that it's not always possible. In a way, this perhaps crude and oversimplified instance can be likened to the gist of Project Civicare, in which * * * you make advance preparations to help yourself as well as be helped. There is a great deal you can do to prepare to survive. If you are able and capable of helping yourself—or getting help for those about you—you ask: "What do I have available here and now with which I can help myself?—not later on when I may not need it at all."

First and foremost in any advance preparation is this: you must keep yourself informed about goings-on in the world from the very personal viewpoint of your "survival capability." Then you make sure that this interest is actively applied to civil defense—and that you help make CD into a workable and realistic structure. Make your views and ideas known, and don't be afraid to call a spade a spade when you feel strongly about an issue—though make all spadework constructive, for it's in your best interest.

Civicare is based upon a simple notion: Science-engineered health and lifesaving supplies will be within your immediate reach when you're most likely to need them—no matter where you are at the time.

You may be in your home, at the office, strolling along the walk, in your auto—or one of a thousand other places. A peace-or-war injured civilian always runs a certain risk—but his chances of survival are many times increased by easy-to-get supplies. Perhaps not able to run or hide (evacuate or seek shelter), he should always be within a short distance of lifesaving items. Not hurt—but still not able to run—he has a far better than even chance of coming through it.

Picture your own city and the districts where you live and travel and work: If hurt, what would you need most? Answer: a nearby science-engineered "medicine chest"—a CIVICARE unit. Envisage your city or town or rural area as having public "medicine chests" strategically placed to serve a given number of people. Their mere presence gives reassurance, which is a big part of survival.

No ordinary "medicine chests" these, the CIVICARE units are specially designed and scientifically built to hold emergency supplies for you when you direly need them during and immediately after a disaster. In this way, a glaring gap in the "survival spectrum" is filled.

Instead of trying to rush supplies in to you right after a disaster—which will usually be an impossibility—the principle behind Project CIVICARE is just the opposite: supplies are cached over the United States well in advance of a disaster. Thus, CIVICARE units will be an integral part of large and small city civil defense complexes, as well as rural areas. As a new dimension in survival fitness, they reinforce and complement the customary bring-it-in-to-you approach.

CIVICARE units will help to make your future brighter and safer; will add in making a foreign nation think twice before throwing a punch, because of the greater survival capability of the target people; and will give you, Mr. Citizen U.S.A. more awareness of your responsibilities, as well as pride in tackling a very knotty problem—that of better civil defense.

What will your CIVICARE unit look like? Both pleasing to the eye and highly functional, picture a model a little higher than a big mailbox, several times longer than it is high. With neat letters telling what it is and how to use it, it will not be an eyesore or a constantly grim reminder, because its architecture fits neatly in with the most modern of structures—being, however, so uniquely designed that it can't be mistaken for anything else.

Of heavy steel or reinforced concrete, so as to be blast, fire, water, gas, and fallout proof, CIVICARE units will be as commonplace as your fire alarm or mailbox—for they will be placed right out in the open so that every man, woman and child can benefit from them.

Opened by radio command from conelrad headquarters, the CIVICARE unit will be designed tamper- and burglar-proof. It will have its own alarm, as well as be connected to the central fire alarm station, so that efforts to gain unauthorized entry in nondisaster times will bring "Johnny Law" on the run. Moreover, it will be a felony—under Federal statute—to crack open a CIVICARE unit and rob it unless it's specifically unlocked for you.

PART III: "WHAT'S INSIDE?"—PROJECT CIVICARE

(By Dr. Jack De Ment)

What's inside? Within its rounded top is a reservoir of fresh, clean water for drinking and first aid. Replenished at necessary intervals, there is then no mistake about whether the water is good. Otherwise, the unit is highly compartmented, to hold supplies—and to prevent adult or tot from climbing inside.

Within the compartments are those things most needed for fast thinking and fast acting. Routinely checked and restocked with fresh or new goods to meet the changing times, the unit will be a living, permanent structure—an integral part of other municipal facilities, right along with your fire hydrant and fire alarm box. It's multifunctional, holding goods to meet situations arising out of fire, flood, earthquake, hurricane, nuclear and CEBAR disasters.

The emergency supplies include those for first aid, communications, radiation equipment, and outright survival tools. Sealed in gastight plastic bags when necessary (to be used for other purposes and labeled as well as transparent so you can see what's inside), here are a few of the items a CIVICARE unit will contain.

First Aid: tape, gauze, bandages; antibiotics and antitoxins; burn jelly; burn shock injectables; sedatives, analgesics, stimulants; detergents; atropine syrettes (for nerve gas); antinauseant (for radiation nausea); probably antiradiation drugs (certain sulfur drugs should make their appearance for this purpose in 5–10 years, or less). Locked in a special compartment will be those items used only by a physician, dentist or trained first aid operator, including emergency surgical tools. Such qualified persons will carry keys to this inner safe, or know the combination. If space permits, a stock of medications for the chronically ill will be present.

Communications-radiation equipment: walkie-talkies; crystal sets permanently tuned to Conelrad; portable public address speaker; radiation detectors; markers. Also, complete sets of easy-to-read, clear instruction sheets on what to do and how to do it, including a Holy Bible. A CIVICARE unit will have mounted flush with its surface—but in a protected position—a radio receiver and speaker that will enable Conelrad to broadcast directly to people gathered around. Wild rumor, then, has much less chance of getting foothold. Idea: A "pop-open" self-inflating tethered, small balloon to show exactly where the CIVICARE unit is—to be actuated by radio signal.

Survival tools: to dive into the tough job of getting the injured out—which you may have to help with—a unit will have hydraulic jacks (for lifting heavy objects); crowbars, sledgehammers, shovels, picks, axes, rope; flashlights and electric lanterns.

"What about fallout?" you ask. The answer is: Quick, on-the-spot survival measures are obviously better than no protection at all or help that comes sometime later or help that's promised but never does come.

In that short interval—the gap in the survival spectrum—immediately after man-made nuclear disaster, few of those directly involved are going to think about invisible fallout and radiation when all effort and energies will be directed to burns, mechanical and blast injuries, and to shock.

So it's a matter of dealing with first things first—not second-guessing or fighting phantoms when there are clear-cut emergencies at hand. Dealing with fallout patterns and radiological throwdown is properly in the domain of outside help—the CD people trained for this purpose, those who get into the act after the immediate and more pressing problems are dealt with by self-help and on-the-spot help.

This, then, outlines the main part of project CIVICARE. Of course, like any plan the detail must be worked out by suitable feasibility and engineering studies—as is the case with modifications and ramifications.

A CIVICARE unit can be available to you for 29 cents—a small sum for preparedness. Then: Make CIVICARE a reality with your support.

CONVENTION OF SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF BARBERSHOP QUARTET SINGING IN AMERICA, INC.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, when people have good will in their hearts and a song on their lips, the world becomes a little better for all of us.

Such people will gather in Philadelphia on June 20 to 24 for the 23d International Convention and Contests of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

From 50 States and the Canadian Provinces, about 5,000 of the society's 28,000 male members, accompanied by families and friends, will gather in the City of Brotherly Love for 5 full days of good fellowship and close harmony singing. The outstanding quartets and choruses in North America, selected through regional competitions, will compete in Convention Hall for the International championship trophies. Afternoons and evenings on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday will be devoted to singing and judging in order to determine the world's best barbershop quartet and top chorus.

Outside Convention Hall—in hospitality suites, hotel rooms, and lobbies—scores of organized and impromptu quartets will "woodshed" for their own amusement and for the amazement of all who care to gather around and listen. It is called the most uninhibited convention in the world and harmony reigns supreme.

The slogan for the convention is "Let Harmony Ring," and men from every section of the United States of America and Canada and representing every trade and profession, will exemplify democracy at its best as they raise their voices in the good old songs of yesteryear.

Who are barbershoppers? They are males of all ages who have an ear and soul for music and better-than-average voices, trained or untrained, who get a big thrill from perfecting a quartet presentation of a ballad. Barbershopping appeals to men of all ages. A teen-age quartet registered as the Four Teens from the U.S. Air Force won an international championship at the Kansas City Convention a few years ago. The society membership has included a President of the United States, Harry Truman, scores of U.S. Congressmen, governors, judges, and mayors.

The convention host chapters, Philadelphia and Delco—Delaware County—have been planning and working for a year on convention and contest arrangements, assisted by the society's headquarters staff from Harmony Hall, Kenosha, Wis. The society's executive director, Bob Hafer, got into barbershopping as the tenor of a small-town quartet in Ohio. The international president is John Cullen, Washington, D.C., attorney, who was active in musical activities at Holy Cross College and helped start the District of Columbia chapter in 1945.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF PASSAGE OF THE RANDOLPH-SHEPPARD ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, paying tribute to JENNINGS RANDOLPH requires effortless indulgence on my part, for I know few men who are more deserving of respect and admiration—who are more devoted to the public good, and to helping their fellow men—than is my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Back in 1936, when our country was still in the grip of the great depression, and when all official thinking was dedicated to getting masses of people back to work, it would have been very easy to overlook the handful of blind people in our midst. They were few in numbers compared to the millions of jobless who walked the streets.

But thanks to the humanitarianism of the late Senator Morris Sheppard, and to JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the blind were not overlooked. They were provided with remunerative employment and economic opportunities to become self-supporting.

At the time the Randolph-Sheppard Act was passed in 1936, by the 74th Congress, there were only four or five blind persons gainfully employed in private employment in the District of Columbia, and earning a total annual income, of approximately $8,000 a year. Today, as a direct result of the Randolph-Sheppard Act, there are approximately 250 blind persons employed in private industry and in the Government, with an estimated total annual income of approximately $1,250,000.

Today, too, there are almost 2,100 vending stands in Federal and non-Federal buildings operated by about 2,220 blind persons, whose gross sales currently amount to approximately $38,225,000, out of which net profits of approximately $7,555,000 are realized.

I especially call the figures, which I have just quoted, to the attention of the "doubting Thomases" of 1936, who thought the blind were necessarily public charges, and who believed that the Randolph-Sheppard Act was a mere "do-gooder" gesture of little value.

Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of passage of the Randolph-Sheppard Act. I just want to call this to the attention of my colleagues, and I also want to pay tribute to Senator RANDOLPH for his vision and his efforts of 25 years ago. His good work at that time has brought succor and comfort to many of our less fortunate citizens throughout the intervening 25 years. I am sure that the people who have been served have a high esteem for my colleague, and I, like my fellow West Virginians, feel that he has earned it.

CAMOUFLAGE OF CONFUSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, all of us in Congress are aware that a serious and critical problem in agriculture confronts us. In this connection, an article by Mr. Asher Byrnes entitled "Camouflage of Confusion," which appeared in the May 1961 edition of Esquire magazine, provides some stimulating thoughts about past experience with the price support program.

Let me cite some statistics which Mr. Byrnes mentions. In 1959 the U.S. Department of Agriculture spent $1,663,000 to assist our wheat farmers. In 1957 the Department lent one farmer $330,000 just to keep his wheat off the market, and in the same year another farmer billed the Department of Agriculture nearly $300,000 for not planting any wheat at all.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to be an agricultural expert, and I fully realize that the farm problem is a complex one. It is my hope that the new feed grains program will help remedy some of the obvious abuses cited in Mr. Byrnes' article. In any event, I think Mr. Byrnes' article serves to highlight some of the problems which must be remedied. Certainly there is no equitable reason why one single farmer should have received $330,000 in the past under the price support program, nor should this happen again in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Byrnes' most interesting article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CAMOUFLAGE OF CONFUSION

(By Asher Byrnes)

Years ago Mencken said, "The farmer is praised by all who mention him. * * * He is praised for his industry, his frugality, his patriotism, his altruistic passion. He is praised for staying on the farm, for laboriously wringing our bread and meat from the reluctant soil * * *. To murmur against him becomes a sort of sacrilege.

"It is the theory of the zanies who perform at Washington that a grower of wheat devotes himself to that banal art in a philanthropic and patriotic spirit, so that the folks of the cities may not go without bread. It is the plain fact that he raises wheat because it takes less labor than any other crop—because it enables him, after working 60 days a year, to loaf the rest of the 12 months."

There have been improvements since then. Now it takes 30 instead of 60 days to plant and harvest a crop of wheat. Farmers also use better seed and sprinkle the ground with fertilizer so that more than 2 bushels grow where 1 came up before. And still better seed is in the offing which will triple this fourfold yield.

What bothered Mencken was that most farmers were asking for Government money, and when these 2-month wheatgrowers joined the others his cup of wrath ran over. Now they have pushed their way up to the head of the line. Wheat farmers are getting the benefit of a third of the Federal funds spent to hike food prices at home and two-thirds of the Government subsidies to promote foreign sales and provide for the free distribution of food abroad—about $1,750 million in 1959. And they are still asking. The only special farm legislation seriously considered in the last session of Congress was a wheat bill.

The other big change is that wheat farmers don't loaf any more. Way out there in the Great Plains States where most wheat is grown they run barbershops, diners, dry goods and furniture stores, gas stations, repair shops, implement dealerships, and other businesses in the 11 or 10½ months that they do not work at tuning up and driving the complex machinery for raising wheat. Others feed cattle on the side. Still others, the wealthier ones, live like resort concessionaires and commute to Florida or California. Actually, all take time off from other occupations in order to raise that wheat.

These part-timers produced more than twice as much wheat as we would eat in 1960. When their harvest was brought in and measured alongside the stock of old wheat [illegible] September, the total supply amounted

to about 2,750 million bushels. All of the people in the United States, including those who are expected to be born, could not possibly consume that much in the next 4 years. There would be a reserve left over in the fifth year to assure the country of a steady flow of bread, cakes, crackers, breakfast foods and seed for the next crop.

It sounds like a nightmare. To the growers and officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture it is, of course, a business. The laws, regulations, administrative decisions, and local usages that have multiplied around it in the past quarter century are numerous and for the most part lengthy and complex. Wheat is surrounded by a camouflage of confusing detail.

The best known of the large operators is Tom Campbell, of Montana, called, "the Wheat King." He is so good at growing it that he has been invited to the Soviet Union in order to show Communists how to run their big collective farms. Here in the United States he works closely with the Government, too. In 1957 the U.S. Department of Agriculture lent him $330,000 to keep his wheat, temporarily, off the market. But negotiations on this scale are common among the big growers. In the same year another large operator, Garvey Farms of Kansas, eliminated all the risk of raising it by billing the Department nearly $300,000 for not planting any.

Such farmer magnates are sometimes talked about as "in-and-outers" in the Wheat Belt, which runs up and down rather than across the country, starting from Montana and proceeding due south to the Texas Panhandle. When the big fellows decide to spread into a new area they arrive with plenty of capital, buying or renting land far and wide. Crews of machine drivers and mechanics follow. Within a week or so the planting (or, later on, the harvest) is through as far as the eye can see, for they give the landscape a workover at the rate of 85 acres per man per day.

These monster wheat enterprises may be 40,000 to 50,000 acres in size, with an investment of $1,500,000 or more in land alone; their machine inventories, even at secondhand prices, are valued at several hundred thousand dollars. Utilizing a third of their acreage in any single crop year, they can produce $500,000 worth of wheat while the rest lies fallow, building up moisture for the next season. This is the big business of agriculture, with its own agronomists, repair shops, supply dumps, two-way radio networks, and airplanes for the top brass.

The ordinary sort of successful wheat farm in the Great Plains is much smaller. It covers from three to nine 640-acre sections of land, with a valuation of $35 an acre in areas of erratic production and about three times as much where the rainfall is dependable. There is on record the case of a wheat farmer who bought a section of land in a high-risk area of Colorado and moved up in time to put in a crop of winter wheat for harvest the next year. The yield was good and the farmer began to buy more land with every dollar he could save or borrow. He accumulated most of his present holding, 6 sections or nearly 4,000 acres, at $5 to $8 per acre—the prices that prevailed a decade ago. Today his land at $35 an acre is worth $140,000 and his implements are valued, in good secondhand condition, at $65,000. He has still other assets, of course, and some debts too; like any good businessman he is not afraid of owing his bank money. To make a long story short his net worth is more than $200,000.

Now all this would not make him outstanding if it were not for the fact that he decided to make a trip to Washington, D.C., to celebrate his eleventh crop, the biggest of them all. He wanted to see the country and, without being bumptious about it, he wanted to tell the Department of Agriculture how one man made good in wheat.

The Department has what is called an Outlook Conference in the fall of each year, with morning and afternoon sessions devoted to the problems of the various farm commodities. The farmer turned up at a wheat session on the forenoon of the fourth day. After the speakers were through he arose and to the surprise of the audience said that for the past 6 years he had not sold a bushel to anybody—he sealed all his wheat for the Government loan. He concluded that the way to succeed in wheat farming was to concentrate on raising it and let the Government take care of selling it, or distributing it or giving it away. "As long as you folks want the wheat, I can produce."

The wheat farmers who are in trouble now are the smaller growers. They are small because they failed to take the chance to expand their enterprises in the 1940's, the Golden Forties when war hunger and postwar relief operations lifted prices from 70 cents to $2.50 a bushel. These little fellows outnumber the business farmers two to one, but they produce only about a tenth of the crop. They are more numerous in cotton, and still more in tobacco, where their advantage as suppliers of cheap labor—their willingness to work for very little—is not offset by agricultural implements that can do the job for even less.

Wheat grows in flat country where the largest implements can be used: tractors with engines that develop as much horsepower as the heaviest trucks, special plows that disk or cultivate the soil as well as plow it in a single operation (wheat farmers call them "one-ways"), tandem drills or seeders with a 36-foot sweep and self-propelled combines that complete the harvest in one pass over the land. Against such competition the small wheat farmer operates precariously, nursing along his overage machinery by dint of his skills as an amateur mechanic and welder.

He's up against another difficulty, too. The Department of Agriculture keeps boosting the price of wheat in the United States—it is now about 54 cents a bushel higher than the average world price. As a result there is a mountainous stockpile of it, and so much new wheat accumulates every year that all efforts to sell, barter, donate or otherwise dispose of it have failed to reduce the surplus.

At the same time, on the production side, the Department tries to control output through a system of wheat-acreage allotments or licenses. It is administered by a force of 9,000 full-time and 3,500 part-time wheat inspectors and bookkeepers, or 1 official to 40 wheat growers. They register and check each allotment or right as part of a specific parcel of land. When any such land is sold, the next farmer buys the right along with the title deed to the property. These allotments are not stable, however; they continue to shrink in commercial wheat areas. They are being cut down by a quirk of the law that has backfired and encourages widespread wheat production in other areas. Marginal commercial operators with 600 to 700 acres, the farmers whom the law is supposed to help, are hurt most by this procedure. Meanwhile, whatever happens, the stockpiles of surplus wheat that have to be bought in by the Government to maintain the price continue to rise higher and higher. Last year's crop was 225 percent of domestic needs.

Congress put together the present wheat-allotment law in the late thirties to replace an older system of quota controls (so many bushels of production allowed to each farmer in proportion to the size of his operation and the capacity of the American consumer to eat it) which proved unworkable for an interesting reason. Farmers always overplant to make sure of reaching their production targets. Who can figure what the weather will be like a season ahead? The result was that overquota wheat kept turning up everywhere; black markets flourished from coast to coast. New legislation was drawn to remove temptation; bushel quotas were translated into acreage allotments at the rate of about 13.3 bushels to the acre. It is so much more difficult for a man to hide the land on which his wheat is growing.

In those days, the difference between the price of wheat and other grains such as corn was small, as little as a nickel a bushel (now the difference is about 80 cents), and farmers in the poultry or livestock business used to raise some of it for feed along with rye, oats, and field corn. They outnumbered the regular wheat farmers and had more votes. If the full weight of the control program were imposed on them they might react and upset everything. So they were given 15-acre exemptions; anybody could grow that much wheat without penalty.

As the controls were applied, the price began to rise. Since the law prevented farmers from planting more, they paid increasing attention to their wheat yields. They began to use synthetic fertilizers and other growth stimulants. The yield of wheat on an acreage basis has now doubled while the bushel price has risen three and a half times. It has become much too valuable to feed to animals. Today the 15-acre exempters are seriously in the wheat business too, and they are so numerous that they could swamp the commercial wheat growers in any referendum by a majority of 25 percent. These sideline wheat farmers are not only livestock and poultry men; they are also growers of garden truck, cotton, soybeans, tobacco, peanuts, and practically everything else produced for the market.

They are united by their ability to recognize a good thing when they see it. In fact, they see it so well that a wheat-State Senator complained, in the debate on a wheat bill in the last session of Congress, that they have taken to splitting up their farms under fictitious ownerships to create additional 15-acre allotments. Still others, he said, are renting these wheat rights from their neighbors far and wide.

Under this act of legislative wisdom, wheat acreage in Alabama has risen 537 percent, in Vermont 407 percent. These 15-acre exempters generally give their wheat the kind of careful cultivation that collectivized peasants in Russia bestow on their private allotments. In good areas they grow three times as many bushels to the acre as the national average. We now have a full year's supply of wheat for the entire country just from these little patches.

Every time another one of those 15-acre plots is planted to wheat in places like Mississippi and Louisiana, farmers in the Great Plains who have been growing it all their lives lose the same amount of acreage, pro rata, when the next reapportionment is made. For the law provides that there shall be a national wheat allotment of no more that 55 million acres. There isn't any limit on the number of 15-acre privileges. Anybody can take up one if he wants it. So the commercial wheat farmers of Kansas have lost 494,000 acres of wheat allotments, Minnesota farmers 700,000 acres, and the wheat farmers of North Dakota 1,041,000 acres.

The wheat problem is a war baby that has never been weaned. It was born 44 years ago, when the United States of America got hitched to the First World War. This offspring of a shotgun marriage was put on a forced diet of dollars to make it grow because what the Allies wanted pronto were groceries and soldiers.

At that time large areas of our Great Plains were still a God-forsaken wilderness. The Homestead Act of 1862 was in full operation, with settlers dribbling in on the fringes to take up their quarter sections (one each for man and wife, or 320 acres per family).

Soil scientists had just discovered that wheat would grow in such semi-arid country if it were planted in alternate years. Since any growth draws moisture from the soil they recommended a new kind of fallowing which involved the destruction of every blade of grass on the uncultivated half of the farmer's acres for a year, then a turn around the next year, and so on. This procedure also required, of course, twice the acreage needed by farmers elsewhere. That was the reason for all those man-and-wife claims to acreage in the Great Plains.

To stimulate wheat farmers the Government guaranteed the price at a dollar a bushel extra, but the demand was so great that it rose still another dollar at terminal markets, making a top of 300 percent above the prewar figure. At the same time the land sown to wheat expanded about 50 percent—and this is the most interesting part of the story.

Boom-time wheat prices triggered a scramble for what was left of the free land. The virgin grasslands of Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma were plowed up far and wide. So were the wild pasture lands in the semi-arid sections of Montana and in the western part of the Dakotas. Sharply rising prices for farm real estate back East reinforced the pressure: good Iowa plowland rose from an average of $200 (in dollars of current value) to $500 an acre, and some of it sold as high as $1,200 an acre. A delirium of speculation in real estate and crops spread over rural America. We've had some of that in the past decade, though on a less frantic basis; nice and easy, in fact, with all cropland owners feeling fine right up to the year before last.

What happens in such cases is that the expectation of rising profits from farm operations is capitalized into the value of the land on which (hopefully) even more money is going to be made.

People sometimes talk as if these inflated values of farmland are similar to the paper profits or unrealized capital gains of speculators in common stocks. That might be so if farmers put their acres in a safe-deposit box, like a bundle of stock certificates. They don't. They're in business on that land. They are tempted to use the new, big value of it as security for a new big loan or mortgage and expand their operations on still more high-priced acreage. Finally, the entire farm economy is jacked up to a price level which permits no backing down without loss. Even a pause in the pace of inflation may produce disaster.

That's what happened 17 months after the war in which the farm problem was born. Wheat was still selling a dollar higher than the figure at which the U.S. Government pegged it—yet when the Government withdrew, the bottom fell out. Prices promptly dropped a dollar and continued falling until they settled around 50 percent below the boom-time peak. The production of wheat, however, fell only 10 percent and fluctuated near that level until the great depression arrived a decade later. This is the clue to all the agrarian hell-raising that so infuriated the sage of Baltimore. The price fell, export demand fell, domestic consumption remained stationary, yet farmers insisted on growing more wheat. They were driven to this irrational behavior by their mortgages and other debts.

The search for a farmer's Messiah began where you'd expect Americans to start, among the politicians. After discarding a succession of public figures they accepted a bankrupt implement manufacturer named George Peek. One day he was looking at the plunging sales charts of the Moline Plow Co., of which he was president. "You can't sell a plow to a busted customer," he decided; and then set to work to develop a gimmick that would raise farm prices at no cost to the U.S. Treasury.

Peek's homebrewed formula is of little interest because it could not have worked. However, the immense agitations involved in debating this nostrum through five Congresses solidified and disciplined the so-called farm bloc and fixed in the heads of farmers a mischievous idea that aggravates the agricultural situation today. They stand united on parity.

What is parity? Briefly, it is a way to figure how much to raise farm prices so that farmers can enjoy the same standard of living as city people without any allowance for their investment income or inventory appreciation. Technically, it is the mathematical relationship or ratio between two indexes, "Prices Received by Farmers," and "Prices Paid by Farmers"; and it is used to measure the purchasing power of products sold by farmers in terms of the things they buy as related, further, to prices and costs in a base period, 1910–1914, the most prosperous period for farmers since the Civil War. These complex figures are computed monthly by the Price Statistics Branch of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

Peek was a high-tariff man and an isolationist. He sold the farmers on the idea that his gimmick would enable them to enjoy the equivalent of the tariff protection which, they and he agreed, accounted for the health of American industry. A Government corporation would be set up to buy the whole crop of wheat, for instance, at the parity price; and the amount needed by American consumers would be resold to them at that price. The surplus left over would be sold abroad at the lower prices prevailing in the world market. To cover the loss on exports the Government would charge farmers a small equalization fee in advance. This assumed there never would be much surplus, even though farmers were again given an incentive price for wheat production.

In time, legislation for this crop was enacted by a Congress anxious to do something special for the farmers who suffered from the big wind that came after the great depression. However, as is the way of things, the beneficiaries were not the busted people Steinbeck talked about in "The Grapes of Wrath." They were the farmers in wheat areas untouched by the duststorms.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act of 1938, which still prevails, provided for the national wheat allotment of 55 million acres, just a bit more than was then required to supply current needs, and permitted those 15-acre exemptions to give all farmers, commercial and noncommercial ones alike, a stake in the benefits. One contingency was overlooked—the progress of scientific agriculture in multiplying yields and increasing productivity. Considering what science had done for the farmer up to that time, this is a mystery. It was assumed that wheat cropping would bumble along on the same basis, around 13 bushels to the acre. But last year it was 26. In 1958 it was 27½ and thus, what with double-size yields and the 15-acre loophole for everyone, wheat has become the most widespread, wasteful, and ridiculous of the farm programs. The present wheat surplus is so awesome that cotton, tobacco and peanut Congressmen became alarmed about the possible effect of this scandal on their own programs last year. They debated measures for cutting it down to size in both Houses, but nothing happened because politicians are loath to cut back anything in an election year.

The wheat problem can't be handled without wringing somebody's heart. Does the new administration mean business this time? In the protracted wheat debates last year, Senators and Members of the House stood up and assured each other that something had better be done before the voters demanded instant action. Then other farm programs might be swept away too.

Remember the rotten eggs that smelled for miles and the thousands of heaps of potatoes along the roadside that were doused with kerosene or dyed blue? The farm bloc was then a mighty band. Now the farm bloc's busted. Returns on the census of 1960 are out. The wealthier farmers have taken over so much of agriculture that the farm population has dwindled to 9 percent of the total. Their political strength is in the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, not on the floor of Congress.

It's time for friends of the farmer to meet reality halfway. Wheat is the main problem. More farmers grow it than any other crop. The surplus stockpiles of wheat are the biggest, the storage and other overhead costs of the wheat program are the highest, and the outlook is the most hopeless. We are eating less wheat every year, and the rest of the world grows more, so we can look to increased sales neither at home nor abroad.

The wheat farmers of the United States received $2 billion for their crop in 1959, a year in which production was a bit above average. Out of this total they had to pay their operating costs. These costs were debated on the floor of the Senate in the early summer of 1960, and it was decided that they averaged half the gross income from wheat. (Actually, the average production cost in the business is less.) When farmers paid their debts for operating expenses in 1959 they were left with a total net wheat income of $1 billion.

Farm accountants figure interest on fixed and working capital, or the cost of the investment in land and implements plus bank loans or personal savings used in production, at the rate of 4 and 6 percent of asset or face value, respectively. At this point we must remember that the wheat industry is scattered and mixed up with other sorts of farm enterprises. We can only arrive at an approximation of the total charge for capital in that business. The average of charges for fixed and working capital as a percentage of net wheat income in five out of seven types of commercial wheat farms was 60 percent in 1959. Subtracting that percentage from the total net wheat income we have a return—call it pay or profit—of about $400 million to wheat farmers and their families.

To enable them to make that much profit, the U.S. Department of Agriculture spent $1,663 million for the stabilization and support of wheat prices in fiscal 1959. This is a net USDA figure for direct expenditures for this purpose only, without administrative overhead.

This cost for raising the price of wheat contrasts sharply with the amount of extra money farmers received as a result of the program. Last year the international price of wheat averaged $1.24 per bushel, and the domestic price was maintained at an average of 50 percent more, or $1.78. Thus one-third, or $665 million of the $2 billion received by U.S. wheat farmers for their crop in 1959 was added by the wheat-support program of the Department of Agriculture. But, as we have seen, the direct cost of that program was $1,663 million. The difference between what the wheat farmers got and how much the Department spent to give it to them is $1 billion.

Wheat is the inclusive farm problem. The first thing we have to recognize is that the 15-acre allotment holder is in wheat for an income supplement, then decide if he ought to get it, and if it should be given him in some other way. As for middle-size commercial growers, they've had several good years. They are worth, as a typical case in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showed, upward of $175,000. They are able to finance some of their own adjustments.

The nine-tenths of us who are not farmers have to make a more difficult adjustment. Such waste in a world so troubled

as ours argues that we are a reckless people, insulated from the realities that hurt other nations by a cushion of dollars, spiritless and evasive in the management of our own affairs—the natural prey of any pressure group that can raise a shout because we respond by throwing out clouds of money. "Our grandchildren may well ask," said one of the Senators last June, " 'What manner of people were these who wasted the soil as though their lives depended on full production when there was no visible outlet for what they produced?' "

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

Mr. RUSSELL. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 397, H.R. 7444.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "a total of $50,000 for".

On page 3, line 10, after the word "stations", to strike out "$76,558,000" and insert "$78,015,500".

On page 4, line 5, after "(21 U.S.C. 114b-c)", to strike out "$55,165,000" and insert "$55,540,000".

On page 5, after line 6, to strike out: "For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for market development research authorized by section 104(a), and for agricultural and forestry research authorized by section 104(k) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $5,265,000: *Provided,* That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses; and, in lieu thereof, to insert: "For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for market development, research authorized by section 104 (a), and for agricultural and forestry research authorized by section 104(k) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $5,265,000: *Provided,* That the dollar value of the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1960, of allocations of foreign currencies heretofore made available to the Agricultural Research Service for the foregoing purposes of section 104(a) is appropriated as of that date and shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses."

On page 6, line 18, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the Secretary may purchase land at a price not in excess of $10 for construction of facilities at Columbia, Missouri."

On page 7, line 2, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$34,053,000" and insert "$36,053,000", and in line 5, after the word "all", to strike out "$34,553,000" and insert "$36,553,000".

On page 8, line 13, after "(7 U.S.C. 347a)", to strike out "$57,220,000" and insert "$58,220,000", and in line 16, after the word "all", to strike out "$58,790,000" and insert "$59,790,000".

On page 9, line 10, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$2,452,000" and insert "$2,477,000".

On page 12, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$22,231,500".

On page 13, line 18, after the word "products", to strike out "$9,049,000" and insert "$9,364,000".

On page 14, line 15, after the word "laws", to strike out "$8,688,000" and insert "$8,978,000".

On page 15, line 13, after the word "evaluations", to strike out "$4,515,000" and insert "$4,795,000".

On page 15, line 18, after the word "States", to strike out "$33,187,000" and insert "$33,370,000".

On page 16, line 9, to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,325,000".

On page 16, line 19, after the word "Act", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That for the purpose of providing additional assistance based on program participation and needs in the States as may be necessary to aid in meeting the nutritional and other requirements of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (7 U.S.C. 1758), not to exceed $10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for assistance under sections 4 and 10 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1753–1754) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe and without regard to provisions of that Act governing the apportionment of funds."

On page 17, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$35,000".

On page 18, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes of market development activities under section 104(a) of that Act, $3,444,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses" and in lieu thereof, to insert "For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes of market development activities under section 104(a) of that Act, $3,444,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the dollar value of the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1960, of allocations of foreign currencies heretofore made available to the Foreign Agricultural Service for the foregoing purposes of section 104(a) is appropriated as of that date and shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses."

On page 19, line 15, after "(7 U.S.C. 1–17a)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,007,000".

On page 20, line 22, after the word "inclusive", to insert "and the amount of a State's basic allocation not so expended shall be available for the State's succeeding program in addition to such program otherwise authorized"; on page 21, line 17, after the word "practices", to insert "including related wildlife conserving practices", and in line 19, after the word "administration", to insert "except that hereafter not to exceed 15 per centum of the basic allocation for any State may be used to increase the State's preceding program".

On page 24, line 2, after the numerals "1961", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$18,500,000".

On page 24, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$312,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "than", to strike out "$10,425,000" and insert "$10,625,000".

On page 25, line 10, after the word "program", to strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$195,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "program", to strike out "$120,000,000" and insert "$150,000,00"; in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$50,000,00", and in line 13, after the word "and", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$12,500,000".

On page 27, line 13, after the word "amended", to strike out "$31,900,000" and insert "$40,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$237,500,000", and on page 28, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$37,500,000".

On page 28, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$33,017,000" and insert $33,167,000".

On page 28, line 23, after the figures "$3,650,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the Secretary may, if he finds it necessary for the more effective and efficient operation of the Department, transfer additional amounts to this appropriation from other appropriations

available to the Department for salaries and expenses for the current fiscal year, but this appropriation shall not be increased by more than 7 per centum by reason of such transfers."

On page 29, line 14, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$3,096,000" and insert "$3,103,500".

On page 29, line 24, after the word "Department", to strike out "$1,584,000" and insert "$1,597,000".

On page 30, after line 17, to insert:

"CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF AGRICULTURE

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for planning, promoting, coordinating, and assisting participation by industry, trade associations, commodity groups, and similar interests in the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; and employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $100,000, including not to exceed $20,000 for additional printing costs of the 1962 Yearbook of Agriculture, to remain available until December 31, 1962."

On page 31, line 10, after the word "members", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,057,000".

On page 35, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$47,500,000" and insert "$47,916,000".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to the bill. It is the supply bill for the Department of Agriculture, which has greatly increased in size in recent years. The bill before the Senate provides $5,967,382,500. This amount represents a very modest increase of $18,916,500 over and above the amount provided in the bill as it passed the other body. The total amount contained in the bill before the Senate, however, is $121,861,500 under the budget estimates.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

The increase of $1,939 million over the appropriations for 1961 is due principally to a doubling up of the appropriations for several items carried in the past as "Special activities." These items, such as sales for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, emergency famine relief, the International Wheat Agreement, and bartered materials for supplemental stockpile, total $1,861,915,000 for 1961 costs.

It should be understood that these are reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the total sum is $418 million greater this year than the amount that was carried for the same items in last year's bill.

The pending bill provides $1,600 million of estimated costs for these items for fiscal year 1962, to put them on a current or pay-as-you-go basis. This is $109 million under the budget estimate. If the costs of Public Law 480 programs exceed this amount, more funds will have to be provided later.

This appropriation of $1,600 million makes it current and thereby provides the Commodity Credit Corporation with that much more borrowing authority for use in carrying out the regular price support programs.

RESTORATION OF CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT

The item for restoration of capital impairment to the Commodity Credit Corporation is $1,017,610,000. This covers the balance of losses that were realized for fiscal 1960. The total losses for 1960 were $1,612,100,000, of which $594.5 million were provided in the regular bill for 1961.

REGULAR ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT

For the regular activities of the Department, the committee recommends an appropriation of $1,397,822,500, an increase of $39.6 million over 1961. This is $12 million under the estimates, and $18.9 million over the amounts carried in the bill as it came to us from the other body.

RESEARCH AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

The committee recommends some modest changes in the appropriations for research, for the Federal research and the "Payments to States" item.

The bill provides $78 million for the Agricultural Research Service, an increase of $6,782,500 over the 1961 appropriations.

I may say that this is one item which is over the budget estimate and the amount recommended by the other body.

The bill provides for the first time $1 million for a contingency research fund, to meet unforeseen and urgent research needs.

The committee also recommended a number of increases totaling one and a half million dollars for what it considers urgent needs on current research.

PAYMENTS TO STATE EXPERIMENT STATIONS

For the research payments to the State experiment stations, an increase of $4 million over 1961 is proposed. This makes the total $36.5 million. One million dollars of this is directed toward investigations of research on the elimination of weeds. This has become a very serious problem.

For payments to States for cooperative extension work, $59,790,000 is provided. This is an increase of $3.2 million of new funds for distribution to the various States under the formula.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

For the agricultural conservation program, the committee recommends an advance authorization for the 1962 program of $250 million, this being the amount that has been authorized for this program for many years.

For soil and water conservation programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service, the committee recommends $176 million, an increase of $20.8 million over 1961. This increase is principally for installing works of improvements in the watershed programs.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The committee recommends an appropriation for the school lunch program of $125 million, an increase of $15 million over 1961. I am sure all the Members of the Senate are aware that a much larger amount than that is furnished for the program through the allocation of surplus commodities and the expenditure of section 32 funds.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee recommends loan authorizations totaling $318 million for the lending programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration. These authorizations are $51 million over 1961 and are $33 million over the amounts provided in the bill as it came from the other body.

For rural electrification loans, the committee recommends the full budget estimate of $195 million, plus a contingency authorization of $50 million, making a total $245 million of new loan authorizations available for 1962.

For the rural telephone authorizations, a total of $162,500,000 is recommended, of which $12,500,000 is for contingency reserve authorization.

I believe that brief statement covers the larger items in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, I commend the senior Senator from Georgia for the excellent work he has done in handling this complicated and exceedingly important bill now before the Senate. Only modest increases have been made over the House figures. These are mainly increases in authorizations for the REA, RTA, and the Farmers Home Administration, all of which were well justified in the hearings.

The bill as a whole represents a very sound approach to the fiscal problems of agriculture, and the amount that is being asked for is needed.

I support the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about a matter on which I addressed a letter to him, which appears at page 1090 of the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MAY 24, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a small fruit-breeding station at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Ill., and in connection with the work they have been doing, there is belief that they could use five greenhouses to good advantage.

It is estimated that the cost of such greenhouses would be approximately, and I repeat approximately, $70,000 and an alleyway to join the greenhouses in the sum of $30,000.

Representative ROBERT MICHEL, a member of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, has also made some comments in support of this project when hearings were held.

One of the reasons for the $30,000 request for alleyways is that due to the nature of the project it is necessary to isolate the greenhouses.

Any consideration the subcommittee can give to this need will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate Minority Leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may interpolate at this point by saying that the matter relates to the building of greenhouses for a fruit-breeding station proposed at the University of Southern Illinois. The whole amount involved would have been

$100,000, but it is my understanding that these greenhouses would have to be built on State, rather than Federal property, and that the committee is apprehensive about setting a precedent that could have no end if that were done. I understand that the committee actually did approve the item, and then decided to take it out because of the State ownership of the land. I should like to have a little amplification as to what the committee would do if the State or university did surrender sufficient land to the Federal Government for this purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee was very anxious to provide for this item. We realize that the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not request a great deal from the Committee on Appropriations. We are familiar with his long record of dealing with the agricultural appropriations bill when he was a member of the other body. He handled it for years. I do not know whether I should say it was at that time my "privilege" or "misfortune" to meet him in conference on many occasions, because in those days he was a very hard man to convince about the appropriation of money.

The committee considered this item. We approved it provided the funds were to be expended on Federal lands. The clerk of the committee investigated and ascertained that the Federal Government owned no lands at this installation. It is, I understand, a worthwhile State station, but we did not feel we could appropriate funds for the building of greenhouses on State land without yielding in the future to the numerous similar requests which the committee frequently receives. So we were compelled, regretfully, to deny the Senator's request.

There are instances, I understand, when title is conveyed to the Federal Government to lands on State stations. But in this instance we were powerless to assist the Senator on this item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator may or may not be able to answer, but in the event sufficient land were conveyed to the Federal Government for this purpose, what, in the Senator's judgment, would be the action of the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is always difficult to undertake to predict what action any committee of the Senate will take; but if this were a cooperative project—and I understand that State experimental work is carried on there with both State and Federal funds—I know of no reason why the committee should not approve this very modest request, if the greenhouses were to be constructed on lands owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

BERLIN—A STRATEGIC AREA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the city of Berlin today occupies in world affairs one of the great strategic areas of the world.

I intend to discuss this issue from a bipartisan point of view. As the senior Republican in the U.S. Senate, it is my judgment that the paramount question to which the Berlin issue relates in many aspects is that of our national survival—and the survival of this Nation transcends all consideration of partisanship.

The safety and protection of the American people transcend all considerations of political parties. The least we can do for the American people is to give them all the facts and let them know where they stand in this hour of continued crisis.

We have had a desperate need for a foreign policy which Americans can understand; and which our allies understand; and—most of all—which our enemies can understand.

In our approach to some problems of our foreign relations we have seemed at times to blow hot, and then to blow cold. During those times in the past we did not assume a clear, concise position which the world could understand. We have had a clear position on Berlin in the past, but now, because of a suggested new proposal, we need to emphasize the firmness and clarity of our position.

Last Wednesday, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered in the Senate an important address, during the course of which he advanced one solution to the problem. While he made clear that he was speaking for himself, he still is known as his party's spokesman in the Senate. His proposal was that Berlin, East and West, might be reunited as a free city, to be held in trust by an international authority.

Under his plan, the free city would be guaranteed jointly by the Western Powers united in NATO and Eastern Powers united in the Warsaw Pact. Entrance to the city from the West would be controlled by what he termed "international peace teams."

The highly respected majority leader, as we all know, made the proposal in all good conscience. I also know he will welcome the opinions of others.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to the proposition that has been suggested.

The proposal, in some respects, resembles the short-lived Trieste agreement. It might work if Mr. Khrushchev wanted it to, but it seems quite obvious that if he actually desired any settlement on Berlin he would not have been using it to make trouble for so long a time.

The importance of the proposal suggested by the distinguished majority leader has raised questions in newspapers, on TV and radio, and among people generally as to the extent to which someone else might try to use it as a trial balloon for the President and his Department of State. The Senator was speaking on his own, but I know he recognizes what importance is attached to his suggestion.

The Trieste agreement, for example, was signed February 10, 1947, and held as a free territory under United Nations supervision. By October 5, 1954, it was divided between Yugoslavia and Italy, and the free territory is no more. Yugoslavia got what it wanted of the free territory.

Under four Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—the United States, as well as other Western Powers, has been committed to defend the independence of the western part of Berlin and to maintain contact with it. Of course, this formula could, I suppose, be interpreted in varying degrees by the world's diplomats. But the position of the United States has been absolutely firm; we spent millions of dollars and sacrificed many of our young airmen in the famed airlift which stood forth as a symbol before the world that we act on what we say.

This is no time for weakness. It is a time for a cold, realistic clarification of where we stand, what we propose to do, and what we expect the U.S.S.R. to do.

Mr. Khrushchev continues to make the cold war colder, and abuse of the United States has been one of the principal methods he has used to discredit and belittle the United States.

At all times we must maintain our honor, respect, and prestige. We cannot for a moment back down on Berlin. American leadership in world affairs would be greatly weakened.

If history has taught us anything, it has shown that where peace is concerned there can be no vacillation or retreat.

Mr. President, it seems to me that now is the time to take a forceful step in the direction of respect by making it definitely known, once again, that our position on Berlin has not changed.

Berlin represents one of the few remaining symbols of the free world's determination not to be cowed by the bully tactics of the Russian bear.

Briefly, our position on the future of Germany and the issue of Berlin has been that:

First. East and West Berlin should be united by free elections, and the city's freedom should be guaranteed by the United States, France, Britain, and the Soviet Union until such time as Berlin becomes the capital of a reunited Germany.

Second. German reunification would become a fact with the election of an all-German parliament, formation of an all-German government, conclusion of a peace treaty between Germany and her former enemies, and withdrawal of all foreign troops under adequate safeguards.

Again, I point out, these have been basic objectives of our foreign policy through the administrations of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

In reporting on his Vienna talks with Premier Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy reaffirmed our intention not to be intimidated into backing out of West Berlin. What Mr. Kennedy told us sounded like tough, straight-from-the-shoulder talk, as indicated by this excerpt from his remarks:

> I made it clear to Mr. Khrushchev that the security of Western Europe and therefore our own security are deeply involved in our presence and our access rights to West Berlin; that these rights are based on law, not on sufferance; and that we are determined to maintain these rights at any risk

and thus our obligation to the people of West Berlin and their right to choose their own future.

The President, in those words, upholds the same principles on Berlin that were maintained by the three previous Presidents.

If the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader ever came to pass, it would be a definite change. I, for one, see no reason why a Russian threat to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany should cause us to change our course.

Of course, I have no quarrel with the majority leader's right to express his opinion. In our justly cherished free society with opportunity for debate and free expression, all viewpoints must be explored and given due weight. This country of ours is the greatest and strongest on earth. It was made that way through the qualities of courage, intelligence, morality, and plain commonsense of individual Americans.

We are, perhaps, sometimes slow to act, and too often leave the impression that we are soft. But the world is beginning to understand that humanity is not softness—that the fiber of America is no less strong than it was in 1776.

Our military posture, our domestic prosperity, in fact, our very survival as a nation, are affected by success or failure in the conduct of our foreign relations. In my opinion, any weakening of our position on Berlin would constitute a major foreign policy failure.

Regardless of the zigs and zags of Russian diplomacy, regardless of their frowns and smiles, we must never forget that the Communist goal always remains to make the world bow down before the hammer and sickle. So, in my judgment we should not retreat on Berlin.

If we back down in any degree on Berlin, I doubt that many nations of the earth will count on our word again. And, in my opinion, we cannot afford to stand alone.

First things must come first. The urgency of the moment, I repeat, is survival itself. The people of this country must prepare themselves for a rough and tough road ahead; but they cannot expect the Nation to wipe away each of their tears.

I cannot in good conscience, Mr. President, let the proposed new status of Berlin pass without my opposition. And I shall vigorously and strenuously oppose any change which would weaken our position, until the very end.

In conclusion, let me state that the threat to the United States is many sided. One is by internal subversion; another, by economic penetration; others, by espionage, blackmail, and military might. But there is still another—an important one—and that is a show of weakness which might be taken as appeasement. And, appeasement is nothing more than surrender on the installment plan.

For that reason, I am utterly opposed to changing our position on Berlin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I wish to express to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the ranking Republican Member of this body, my deep appreciation and thanks for the speech he has made this afternoon, and I desire to compliment him for the high tone in which it was delivered.

Whether one speaks for or against the proposal advanced by the senior Senator from Montana is immaterial. The point is that we ought to speak and think and cogitate while there is still time to do so, and in an unemotional way. Time is of the essence in connection with this matter. In my opinion, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has rendered the country and the Senate a service, today, in bringing to our attention his views on this question, the most important immediate question of our time.

The Senator from New Hampshire was gracious enough to tell me ahead of time that he was going to make his speech, and to furnish me with a copy of his remarks.

If I may, I should like to make a few comments on what he has said, and then make some comments of my own.

For example, the Senator from New Hampshire stated:

> The safety and protection of the American people transcend all considerations of political parties. The least we can do for the American people is to give them all the facts and let them know where they stand in this hour of continued crisis.
>
> We have had a desperate need for a foreign policy which Americans can understand—and which our allies understand—and most of all, which our enemies can understand.

I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

A little later he said:

> Last Wednesday, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana delivered in the Senate an important address, during the course of which he advanced one solution to the problem. While he made clear he was speaking for himself, he still is known as his party's spokesman in the Senate. This proposal was that Berlin, East and West, might be reunited as a "free city," to be held in trust by an international authority.

I appreciate what my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, has said relative to his acknowledgment of the fact that I was speaking for myself, because I was; and, as a matter of fact, to this day I have not discussed this matter with either the President of the United States or the Secretary of State, because I feel that I have some responsibilities as a Senator of the United States.

A little later, the Senator made reference to the Trieste agreement. He said:

> The Trieste agreement, for example, was signed February 10, 1947, and held as a "free territory" under United Nations supervision. By October 5, 1954, it was divided up between Yugoslavia and Italy and the "free territory" is no more. Yugoslavia got what it wanted of the "free territory."

Let me call to the attention of the Senate the fact that that treaty, which seems to have been agreed to by both Italy and Yugoslavia as being eminently satisfactory at that time, came about because of the outstanding work done in its behalf by Clare Boothe Luce, who at that time was U.S. Ambassador to Italy, and by Llewellyn Thompson, who at that time was U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria. In fact, Ambassador Thompson spent so much time on the treaty that he was almost always in London, trying there to work out the arrangements, and rarely was in Vienna.

Later in his remarks the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said:

> This is no time for weakness. It is a time for cold, realistic clarification of where we stand, what we propose to do, and what we expect the U.S.S.R. to do.

I agree completely.

Further on in his speech, the Senator from New Hampshire stated:

> If history has taught us anything, it has shown that where peace is concerned there can be no vacillation or retreat.

Again I wholeheartedly agree.

Further on in his speech my friend had the following to say:

> The distinguished majority leader's suggestion, if it ever came to pass, would be a definite change.
>
> I, for one, see no reason why a Russian threat to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany should cause us to change our course.

Let me say that that possibility had nothing to do with the remarks I made last week, because if I correctly understand the historical situation, whenever the Soviet Union desires to sign a treaty of peace with East Germany, it can do so, and there would be nothing that we or our allies could do about it.

Further on, the Senator from New Hampshire said:

> Our military posture, our domestic prosperity, in fact, our very survival as a nation, are affected by success or failure in the conduct of our foreign relations. In my opinion, any weakening of our position on Berlin would constitute a major foreign policy failure.

At this time, I should like to read an excerpt from an editorial published in the Christian Science Monitor on June 17, 1961. I believe that these few words, more than anything else I have read or heard, sum up what I was trying to do when I was privileged to address the Senate, last Wednesday, on this question. I quote now from the editorial:

> In this respect the proposals advanced in the U.S. Senate by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, a day before the Khrushchev broadcast make a great deal of sense. These proposals, which are put forward by the Senate majority leader personally and not on behalf of the Kennedy administration, should be read—

And I wish to direct the attention of the Senator to this—

> should be read not as a substitute for full insistence on Western rights in West Berlin but as a possible supplement to the Anglo-French-American diplomatic position.

Further on, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire says:

> First things must come first. The urgency of the moment, I repeat, is survival itself. The people of this country must prepare themselves for a rough road ahead, but they cannot expect the Nation to wipe away each of their tears.
>
> I cannot in good conscience, Mr. President, let the proposed new status of Berlin pass without my opposition. And, I shall vigorously and strenuously oppose any change which would weaken our position, until the very end.

I can find no real argument there, because I do not think that I was advocating a weakening of our position in Berlin, or a backing away, or a retreat, in the proposal which I advanced. As the Christian Science Monitor indicated, I was trying to bring about a possible supplemental position insofar as our status in that area was concerned.

There has been some reference to the fact that I am the majority party's spokesman in the Senate. I do not know how to answer this. I suppose that is a cross I have to bear on occasion, just as the distinguished minority leader has to bear a somewhat similar burden if he makes a speech and is thereby considered as the spokesman of his party. But let me say, knowing the 100 Senators of this body, no Senator can speak for any other Senator. So far as we are concerned, leader or not, we are on an equal basis.

Before any Senator is a majority leader, he is the Senator of the State from which he comes, and he is a Senator of the United States. Before a Senator has responsibilities to any administration, he has responsibilities to the people of the United States in the light of his conscience.

Several days ago I made a statement on Berlin as a Senator from Montana, as one Senator with responsibilities to the people of his State and the Nation. The statement was not at any time, or in any way, discussed in advance with any person in the executive branch. It was not intended as praise for this administration or criticism of its predecessor. And it was in no sense a "trial balloon."

The statement proposed that we face the facts of the situation which is developing at Berlin and that we face them now and discuss them fully, just as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire did in his service to the country this afternoon. It contained a proposal which suggested a third way on Berlin—neither that which the Soviet Union has proposed nor that which presently exists. The statement was designed to invite discussion in the Senate of this grave situation and to elicit further proposals with respect to that situation. For in this matter, the Senate has a responsibility, even as the President of the United States has the ultimate responsibilty.

The developments in Berlin involve the entire future of the United States, the Soviet Union, Europe, and the world. Therefore I trust that any discussion will reflect the seriousness and soberness of this situation. And I trust, furthermore, that the discussion will not be bent to political purposes.

Let me say again that I commend and compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for the nonpartisan, frank, and honest way in which he discussed his reaction to the Berlin situation on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Finally, I trust that we will bear in mind in this discussion the weight of responsibility which rests on the shoulders of the President. He must make decisions on behalf of all of us—decisions which bind us all. He must make these decisions knowing that, in the end, if reason fails, either here or elsewhere, what may be involved is the life of every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

In these circumstances, every responsible citizen of this Nation, and especially those with public responsibilities, will think and speak with the soberness the situation requires. That, may I say, was characteristic of the discussion in the Senate on the part of both Republican and Democratic Senators after my statement the other day. And I hope that it is a characteristic which will be maintained as this discussion widens, and I am sure it will be, based on the statement by the Senator from New Hampshire this afternoon.

Following my previous speech I received a large response, for a Senator from Montana, in the mail. More than half the letters I received were from Texas, California, New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. The letters were unfavorable to the proposals which I made on Berlin in a ratio of about 4 to 1.

A great many of these letters contained attacks on my integrity, motives, and patriotism. I do not relish these attacks, since my skin is no thicker than that of any other Senator. But if personal vilification is the price which must be paid for full public discussion of this critical issue, then it will be paid, regardless of whether the discussion tends to support my view, or oppose it, or take some other turn.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As the distinguished Senator knows full well, speaking for myself, and I think for most people of this country, and certainly for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, there is no question about the integrity or patriotism of the Senator from Montana, or his effort to do what he considers in his conscience to be for the best interests of this country. I for one am very happy the Senator from Montana occupies the position that he does. I happen to differ with him on his approach, but I know his motives are of the highest, and I am sorry anyone would vilify him or question his motives in the discussion of this issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am deeply grateful to my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, for these remarks; but as far as my colleagues in this body are concerned, I have no doubt that every Member feels toward me as I feel toward them—and I say this with all due modesty—as the Senator from New Hampshire has expressed himself, because I think we get to know one another here and to have an understanding of the problems and confrontations which occur from time to time.

I do not mind this criticism, and I did not rise to protest it. All of us, being in the profession we are in, have to anticipate some criticism. If we were not criticized, I would say there was something wrong with us, because nobody in this Chamber or anywhere else can advance proposals which will meet with the full approval of the people of this country or with the full approval of the people of a State, and neither can anyone vote without that chance, because there is always someone who will criticize. That is fine. I only hope that when criticism is made it will be made on the basis of the criticism advanced by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, which is criticism of a constructive nature, because on that basis we can all benefit and the country will be better off.

Mr. President, the issue which confronts the people of this Nation at Berlin is fundamental. We are fully committed at Berlin, all of us, and lest there be any misunderstanding of this commitment, I repeat what I said last Wednesday:

> We will not be driven, pushed or barred from fulfilling our responsibilities to ourselves and to freedom in Berlin by any nation, half-nation, group of nations or whatever. Such measures as may be necessary to assert that responsibility will be taken. * * * The range of this commitment extends from a beginning of the words of firmness to a midpoint of expenditure of immense resoures and enormous taxes and other sacrifices, to a final pledge of the lives and fortunes of every man, woman and child in the Nation.

I do not take this commitment lightly. And because I do not, Mr. President, I regard it as an inescapable responsibility on the part of the Senate to see to it that the question of Berlin is discussed fully and completely and in advance of payment on the commitment. So long as I represent the State of Montana as a Senator of the United States, I shall not regard as closed and beyond discussion any matter which involves the welfare and the very life of every citizen of this Nation as directly as does the Berlin situation. And I shall speak out on these matters whenever my judgment and conscience compel it.

In my statement last Wednesday I offered a proposal for a possible approach to solution of the Berlin question. It was neither the way suggested by Mr. Khrushchev nor merely a continuance of the status quo in that city. It was an attempt to find a third way, not in retreat from where we now stand but in an advance to what I believe may be a firmer ground for peace in Europe. I have based this proposal on the assumption that if West Berlin is defensible as a free city, as an allied enclave 110 miles inside the Communist world, all Berlin as a free city would be even more defensible if it is threatened, for it would still be backed by allied guarantees, as is now the case, and, in addition, by the weight of a world opinion which is overwhelming for peace. The small garrisons in West Berlin, Mr. President, are not what defends that city—it is the allied guarantees of that city's safety, and these will be strengthened, not weakened, under the proposals which I have made, even though some of the interpretations of these proposals may for one reason or another suggest otherwise. I have based these proposals, furthermore, on the belief that any policy which, in effect, insists that the Russians remain in Berlin and Germany, as ours now does, is not only impracticable but also wrong on its face, for our object must be to encourage the withdrawal of Soviet forces eastward if the present costly stalemate in Europe is ever to be brought to an end.

The suggestions which I have made may or may not have merit. They were obviously not intended to be the last

word on this subject. Other proposals may be offered by other Members which may or may not have merit. More important than any particular proposals, mine or those of anyone else, is that this issue and its possible solution be thoroughly explored and, one would hope, explored without rancor or considerations of political advantage, in the light of the best interests of this Nation. As I see it, Mr. President, it is not in the best interests of this Nation to go on spending billions of dollars abroad without bringing closer the day when these one-sided expenditures may be terminated in a more constructive situation—and Berlin alone and directly has already cost this Nation in excess of $1.5 billion. It is not in the best interests of this Nation to spend the lives of citizens and to risk the devastation of this Nation and the world if we can create a situation where this need will be obviated.

To be sure, there may be no alternative. To be sure, in the end we may have no choice but to spend the billions and the lives, but until that end arrives, I, for one, shall go on seeking a better way.

I do not now believe and have never believed in change for the sake of change in public policy any more than in automobiles. But I believe it is essential to the security and welfare of the people of this Nation that we do not doom ourselves to the mental prison of equating all change with retreat and defeat. For in foreign policy, no less than in all other aspects of human existence, an ordered change is the key to rational survival and progress. Unless we are not afraid, first, to consider changes in a world of change and, second, to make changes if reason tells us they should be made, we shall find ourselves, in foreign policy, time and again in pursuit of the last car of a train that is always pulling away from us.

Mr. President, again I commend the Senator from New Hampshire. In my opinion he has performed a real public service this afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of editorials both for and against the proposal advanced by me last week in the Senate be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 17, 1961]

IF MOSCOW REALLY WANTS A GERMAN TREATY

Premier Khrushchev's report to the people of the Soviet Union on his talks at Vienna with President Kennedy is a new statement of old pretensions. These pretensions do not take on any more validity from the fact that they have been voiced for 2½ years, but there is danger of their becoming partly accepted by familiarity.

The head of the Communist bloc says, "The absence of a peace treaty with Germany has created a deeply abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe." He adds the charge that Britain, France, and the United States broke postwar agreements by turning West Germany into a militarist state, whereas the facts are the Soviet authorities first closed off their occupation zone and began there development of paramilitary forces under the Soviet Army.

Thus began the problem of a divided Germany and of a Communist puppet regime in East Germany which has no basis in the wishes of the people but ruled by Russian-backed force. That is "a deeply abnormal and dangerous situation" but it is not the one Mr. Khrushchev likes to talk about.

He prefers to focus attention on West Berlin, where he proposes what would technically be called a free city but which would, in fact, end the freedom of more than 2 million West Berliners within a few years. Unless that proposal is accepted, he threatens before the end of the year to make a treaty with his pawns, Walter Ulbricht and company, which he pretends would give them complete control over access to Berlin.

COMMUNIST PLANS FOR WEST BERLIN

If they used that control with scrupulous respect for the rights of West Berliners to come and go, and for the rights of others to visit and trade with them, the situation would not be materially worsened. But what Mr. Ulbricht has in mind is indicated by a press conference in which he suggests that the Tempelhof Airport, which was West Berlin's lifeline in the blockade of 1948, be closed, and that West Berlin cease to grant asylum to East German refugees.

What Mr. Khrushchev envisages can be inferred from his parroting of a completely fictitious Communist claim that the half city of West Berlin "is situated on territory of the German Democratic [East German] Republic." There was no East German state when the postwar outlines of Berlin were drawn. As a matter of fact, especially if they protest a West German Parliament meeting in West Berlin, the Communists have no right to install the East German Government in East Berlin, since even the Soviet sector of that city is on a different legal footing from the Soviet occupation zone around it.

In this respect the proposals advanced in the U.S. Senate by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, a day before the Khrushchev broadcast make a great deal of sense. These proposals, which are put forward by the Senate majority leader personally and not on behalf of the Kennedy administration, should be read not as a substitute for full insistence on Western rights in West Berlin but as a possible supplement to the Anglo-French-American diplomatic position.

CONCESSIONS AND COUNTERCONCESSIONS

So long as Soviet arrogance tries to undermine the safety of West Berlin and its people (with stratagems reminiscent of the Nazi encompassment and capture of the free city of Danzig) the West should stand flatly on every sentence and comma of its occupation rights in defense of the West Berliners.

One of the hollow aspects of the Khrushchev position is the pretense that Moscow seeks a peace treaty as to all of Germany in conjunction with its wartime allies. If this were more than a sham, the Kremlin would deal seriously with the Western contention that the whole German people should have an opportunity to vote on their future status.

If Mr. Khrushchev and his foreign office have any thought of achieving an agreed settlement on the narrower and included question of Berlin, they might consider what arrangements in return could conceivably compensate for the concessions they ask and provide reliable safeguards for the people of West Berlin. This, in effect, is what the Mansfield plan asks the Communists—or others who pass judgment on issues of the cold war—to do.

First, for example, if a free and internationalized status would be good for half a city (West Berlin), why would it not be at least twice as good for a whole city, including East Berlin? The first postulate that should be laid, therefore, in any thought of changed conditions for Berlin is that the change should apply to the whole city.

REAL INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY NEEDED

Even that would be far from enough to assure the security of the city's government or the ultimate physical safety of its citizens. Earlier statements have suggested that some international authority guarantee the neutrality and self-government of West Berlin. The only authority remotely capable of doing this—and its capability in such a great-power vise would be very doubtful until proved in other cases—would be the United Nations. Yet the United Nations would certainly be estopped from giving any effective protection to an area such as Berlin if Mr. Khrushchev should succeed in introducing his fragmentation of the secretariat by a three-party veto.

The residents of Berlin also would need absolutely dependable and even enlarged guarantees of freedom of passage for themselves, their goods, and their guests going to and from Berlin through the 110-mile corridor to West Germany. As to this, Mr. Khrushchev says with one breath that the Soviet Union favors free access and with the next breath that the East German Communists could take it away.

The Mansfield formula is that the city's neutrality be guaranteed by the members both of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Warsaw Pact, and that Western access routes to the city be garrisoned with international peace teams.

These points, it should be recognized, are counterproposals to the Soviet demands, not modifications of the American, French, and British insistence on their right to protect West Berliners at the West Berliners' request.

Incidentally, one translation has Premier Khrushchev saying, "The Western Powers say they will insist on their rights in West Berlin. That is a threat to peace." Since when did it become a threat to peace for any nation to insist on its rights? The official Tass version has smoothed up this passage, but the characterization is essentially true of the Communist position.

CHANGES SHOULD NOT BE ONE SIDED

Premier Khrushchev goes out of his way to say that if any country "violates peace and crosses the borders" of East Germany it will be met with Soviet weapons. President Kennedy explicitly assured the Soviet leader at Vienna that so long as the rights of access are respected there would be no use of force. But if either Soviet or East German authorities should interpose barriers, that would be the initial use of force.

The Communists have no moral or other right to demand that the West sacrifice the safety and liberties of 2 million people even in the name of peace—that is, to dissuade the Communists from breaking the peace.

Theoretically, it is quite possible to imagine a better and more stable situation for Berlin than now exists. But to accomplish this would require substantial concessions from both sides, not just from one. If a bargain is to be struck, it should be for the benefit of all, particularly the West Berliners. If Moscow expects the West to consider modification, it should be willing to consider equally important and more necessary ones.

Only on this basis should the Western three powers contemplate any bargaining about Berlin. Not one cardboard kopeck should be given up without full value for the security of West Berliners in return. If anyone calls this intransigeance, let him ask if he would like his own security dealt with on any other basis.

Viewed as an exercise in analysis of what guarantees the Communists ought to be willing to give in return for what they now are brashly and brazenly demanding, the Mansfield plan has value. It should not be regarded in any other light, certainly

not as any weakening of Western resistance to attempted intimidation.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 16, 1961]

BERLIN DILEMMA

Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD has contributed an idea to the latest battle over Berlin.

He says Nikita Khrushchev's proposal to convert West Berlin into a free city and to kick out the Western Powers is unacceptable. But he adds that the Western policy of standing on the status quo is not necessarily the way to peace.

A third way, he suggests, might be to convert the entire city—East and West—into a free city; "held in trust and in peace by some international authority until such time as it is again the capital of Germany." Access routes to the city would be guarded by international peace teams.

Senator MANSFIELD's suggestion has the merit of some fresh thinking on a problem that has plagued the world since the end of the war and periodically becomes a dangerous crisis area. Khrushchev indicates he is heading for another flash crisis there at the end of this year.

The Senate leader also calls for widespread discussion and debate about the Berlin problem. The best place to start would be at the beginning—way back in the late 1940's—to refresh the world's memory on why Berlin exists today in an extremely abnormal state.

To listen to Moscow, this is all the fault of the Western Powers and the West Berliners.

The fact is that the Soviets, in 1948, walked out of the four-power (United States, Britain, France, Russia) kommandatura after they got the short end of a free, Berlin-wide election. They set up their own puppet municipal regime in East Berlin and thus divided the city in two. They even cut the telephone cables between the two halves of the city. Even today it is impossible to make a telephone call between East and West Berlin.

There is going to be a lot of shouting about Berlin in the months ahead and the world should be reminded how the present situation developed.

It is difficult to believe that anyone who knows the facts about Berlin—or who has had the fascinating experience of seeing that divided city—ever could give even second thoughts to Khrushchev's outrageous proposal.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1961]

SONG BY THE FIRESIDE

It's all very simple. If the United States and the West will just agree to Soviet policy on Berlin, Laos, the United Nations, nuclear tests and disarmament, we'll all coexist splendidly. Last one to give in is a warmonger.

That, in essence, represents the chatty content of Mr. Khrushchev's fireside chat to the Soviet people. He expressed satisfaction over his talks with President Kennedy in Vienna; but the satisfaction, if any, must have derived principally from the opportunity to clarify what are almost completely opposite positions. From the standpoint of the United States and its allies, about the only reasonable aspect of Mr. Khrushchev's presentation was its relatively restrained tone.

The Soviet leader has adopted the troika as his mode of international conveyance to the United Nations, nuclear tests and virtually every other issue. He wants general and complete disarmament, and unless his terms are accepted the United States is against it. He wants a neutral and independent Laos, but the Americans are somehow responsible for the continued truce violations by the Communist Pathet Lao. The Soviet Union does not want a war, but it is going to sign a treaty this year giving control of the access to Berlin to East Germany, and anyone who resists will be guilty of aggression.

Well, it is a pretty dismal line—about as reasonable as the sort of stuff once spouted by a fellow named Hitler. Berlin is of course the most troublesome issue, and there is considerable point to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's call for the West to abandon some of its fictions about the problem and seek to mount some counterpressure for improved status of Berlin. But to use a Soviet metaphor, the chance of anything better, in Mr. Khrushchev's present mood, seems about as likely as fried snowballs. All of which means that the West had better prepare for a tough test of nerves this fall.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 17, 1961]

ACHESON HEADS TASK FORCE TO WATCH BERLIN

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—President Kennedy has formed a special task force to keep watch on the Berlin crisis. It is headed by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Mr. Acheson, who is widely known for his tough unyielding stand on maintaining the freedom of West Berlin, is currently completing a report on the alternative responses open to the West in light of heightening Soviet pressure designed to drive the Allies out of the city.

After the report is finished Mr. Acheson is expected to serve as the administration's chief crisis watcher on the Berlin situation, ready to give warning and advice on all new developments.

ENCOURAGES BERLIN

The key role on Berlin to be played by Mr. Acheson is particularly welcome to the West Germans, who in the past few days have been fretful over reports of alleged changes in American policy.

In fact, the State Department has spent much of this week trying to calm fears aroused:

1. By a speech in which Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Senate majority leader, proposed accepting the "free city" idea for West Berlin if the same system were extended to East Berlin. This alarms the West Germans, who feel psychologically that the physical presence of Americans in Berlin is the best deterrent to Russian action against the city. Under the Mansfield idea, all Allied occupation troops, including American, would in due course leave Berlin.

2. By reports out of London that the United States was contemplating a radical new approach to Berlin.

The State Department has diplomatically disowned the Mansfield idea and denied that it was in any sense an administration trial balloon—a conclusion drawn by most European papers. It also denied that any radical new approach on Berlin was contemplated.

Mr. Acheson's assignment to the Berlin problem will be a reassurance to the Europeans in itself, for he agreed completely with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in opposing Soviet desires to make unilateral changes in Berlin's status.

Mr. Acheson is on record as saying: "The present status of the Western Allies in Berlin is highly satisfactory. Why fuss around with other ideas? Premier Khrushchev is the only one who wants it changed."

U.S. REPLY IS FIRM

The American reply to Mr. Khrushchev's most recent memorandum on Berlin was the subject of consultation here today with both Britain and France. The American draft reply is firm, refuses to contemplate the changes proposed by the Russians, but leaves the door slightly ajar for negotiations on the issue.

Mr. Acheson will be assisted in his Berlin task force mainly by specialists from within the administration such as Walt Whitman Rostow, Deputy White House Assistant on National Security Affairs; Foy Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; and others.

There have been unconfirmed reports that Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the commander in Europe during the Berlin blockade of 1948, might be included in the task force of crisis watchers because he has had decision-making experience in dealing with Soviet pressure. It was not ruled out at the White House today that General Clay might be consulted, but his aid has as yet not been requested.

[From the New York Post, June 18, 1961]

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S HERESY

Once again Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, has made a valiant effort to generate fresh thought on the problem of Berlin and rescue the West from the peril of its own cliches. His suggestion that the status quo in the divided German city is not sacrosanct seems to have sent a shudder of horror through Bonn and provoked frenzy in the top echelons of the GOP. It deserves a more responsible hearing.

MANSFIELD's proposal, similar to a plan he advocated 2 years ago, would erase the line between East and West Berlin and unify the two sectors as one city whose freedom and accessibility would be internationally guaranteed by NATO, the Warsaw Pact countries and both West and East Germany. In view of Mr. Khrushchev's drive to sign a peace treaty with the German Communist regime and transfer to it the responsibility for keeping West Berlin's communications lines open to the free world, MANSFIELD's plan might honorably save the city from the attrition that Communist leader Ulbricht has outlined. It might also avert an explosive world crisis.

Our adamant insistence that a position adopted more than a decade ago must remain unchanged despite a major shift in the East-West balance of power plainly remains the battlecry of West German politicians; no one dares to question the formula. But must German internal politics mute all debate here? Is no new idea tolerable? Must we sit back and wait for Khrushchev to set the timetable of crisis?

Senator MANSFIELD is basically asking whether we can properly ignore the possibility of a third way out of the dangerous Berlin deadlock. He sees more clearly than most Western statesmen that to stand firm on Berlin while it remains a pivot of new disaster for mankind may be a fetish rather than a policy. When and how the flashpoint will be reached, as Joseph Barry notes in his dispatch from Paris on magazine page 9, no one precisely knows. Nor is there any allied agreement on how to recognize it, to say nothing of handling it. MANSFIELD's third way provides hope that the explosive issue can be solved without either side surrendering any crucial principle or special advantage.

The proposal is not, as Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK were so quick to charge, a renunciation of our pledge to defend West Berlin. Neither does it mean abandonment of Germany's hope of eventual reunification—for which, incidentally, there is more lipservice than real longing in today's prosperous Federal Republic. It simply reflects, as MANSFIELD stated, an "honest recognition of the fact that it is too late in the game to expect that Germany will be reunified in peace by fiat of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Russia, as was expected 15 years ago."

MANSFIELD wants to do more to preserve Berlin as a symbol of freedom than issue periodic declarations of our fidelity.

If it is said that his plan is unacceptable because it may involve the recognition of East Germany, which is one of Mr. Khrushchev's goals, let us not panic. Nonrecognition of the Communist regime is one of Dr. Adenauer's most precious pieties. But in terms of world peace and Berlin's freedom, it may also be one of the most dispensable.

Admittedly there are hazards involved in Senator MANSFIELD's proposal, but Senator CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, observed sanely that it was a good starting point for exploration.

And that is the vital point. Reasonable men may differ on the merits or practicality of MANSFIELD's ideas. What is inexcusable is the suggestion that he was guilty of some high crime by bringing up the subject. In a world as precarious as ours, no man has the right to say that the last word has been spoken on any great issue.

(This editorial was broadcast on June 15, 1961, over WRDW Television, Augusta, Ga.)

This is a WRDW-TV editorial.

"Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster for mankind"—these 13 words concluded an address made by Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD on the floor of the U.S. Senate. In that address Mr. MANSFIELD suggested a third alternative in the Berlin situation.

The Senator stated that he did not believe that "the way to peace can be found either in the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin or in the change which Mr. Khrushchev proposes."

Senator MANSFIELD suggests that the entire city of Berlin be put under an international trusteeship. Under such a plan, routes of access would be garrisoned by international peace teams * * * both East and West governments would pay the cost of such an arrangement under written agreements, and the interim status would be guaranteed by the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. Such a change in Berlin would be terribly difficult, but as the Senator put it, "It is not, really, an infinitesimal task when compared with the full implications of an essay in military solution with what comes after it."

As Mr. MANSFIELD states, "This approach may evoke no response from Mr. Khrushchev. But do Mr. Khrushchev's reactions, whatever they may be, dissolve us from our rational responsibilities to ourselves and to the world in this situation?"

Mr. MANSFIELD has thought well when he says, "If the present positions of the parties concerned remain unchanged, sooner or later, this crisis postponed, this crisis avoided, will cease to lie dormant. If we wait for the moment of heat, it may be too late to think at all."

The Montana Senator concluded, "Sooner or later the Western nations and the Soviet Union must seek a new way, a third way to the solution of the Berlin problem. Unless this search is pursued with energy and dispatch and to fruition, sooner or later, Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster for mankind."

Once again, we feel that Senator MANSFIELD has displayed cogent observance and realistic approach and we would agree wholeheartedly with his Berlin proposal.

This was a WRDW-TV editorial, Jack Belt, speaking for WRDW Television.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 18, 1961]

BERLIN

If, as Premier Khrushchev says, the lack of a German peace treaty "keeps alive the smoldering coals of World War II," then Berlin is the bellows that could enflame the world in another conflagration.

During the 16 years Germany and Berlin have been divided, the Russians have had only to squeeze the bellows and world tensions have flared anew.

Premier Khrushchev fanned the flames again last week in calling for a peace treaty which would recognize formally the existence of two German states and end the West's occupation rights in West Berlin. Mr. Khrushchev said if the West was willing to sign such a treaty then he would help guarantee West Berlin's existence as a free city, with necessary access routes.

If the West does not join the Soviet Union, however, in signing such a treaty, he said the Russians would sign unilaterally with the East Germans before the end of the year. This would force the West to make its own arrangements with the East Germans, a situation observers fear might lead to war if the East Germans try to block access routes to the city.

In his latest speech, Premier Khrushchev said "the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany cannot be postponed any longer. A peaceful settlement in Europe must be attained this year."

The Premier's haste is due apparently to a fear that West Germany might become so strong it would be willing to start a war to liberate East Germany or to reclaim land ceded at the end of the war to Poland.

To the West, Mr. Khrushchev's fears seem groundless, but as any visitor to the Soviet Union can testify, the fear in Russia of a rearmed Germany is real indeed.

Premier Khrushchev said a treaty formalizing the borders could help prevent hostilities which he said would "mean war—and a thermonuclear war at that."

The United States supports West Germany's demand for a unified Germany. The United States has no intention of recognizing East Germany, and President Kennedy has said no peace treaty would be signed until free and universal elections were held throughout Germany.

President Kennedy said 2 weeks ago that "we are not seeking to change the present situation" in which allied troops are stationed in West Berlin and have access rights guaranteed by treaty with the Russians. In a Soviet-East German treaty there is an implied threat that war might break out over access rights if the East Germans try another Berlin blockade.

With little compromise visible in these conflicting views, Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD brought a fresh approach to the subject in urging that all of Berlin be made a free city under international protection.

This, he said, would be a third way between the two positions. He said it was his own idea, and not the administration's. The concept, however, met strong opposition.

West Germany immediately rejected the idea, because it would "deepen the division" of Germany. Observers also doubted if the Mansfield proposal would be acceptable to the Communists who carefully have avoided including East Berlin in any plan to set up a free city.

Immediate prospects were for a hardening of positions and an increase of tensions this summer. There is a possibility that the Russians will call an international conference to sign a peace treaty, in which case it is not likely the West would attend.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1961]

DISPUTED AREAS IN THE STATE OF THE UNION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Difference of opinion and full freedom to express and promote them, supply the lifeblood of an open, creative and free society. This is no less the fact because, as is being widely noted, the depth and duration of some of these differences among Americans are producing consequences which suit Premier Khrushchev as well as if he had planned them. But there are controversies which the President has the power to settle insofar as national policy is concerned, yet which continue to rage because of the irresolution or the conflict of policy.

For example, the administration builds up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe, and in the United Nations it weakens the alliance. It is committed to nonintervention in the Western Hemisphere, but the administration trained, equipped and transported the anti-Castro interventionists in Cuba. And then it denied them the airpower coverage without which this amphibious landing had no chance to succeed.

The President is sworn to preserve the purchasing power of the dollar—specifically to leave undisturbed the price of gold. Nevertheless, he has been deluging Congress with Government spending programs for public welfare projects (of which the current $6 billion housing bill as submitted is typical), each in the same tone of urgency that confers a No. 1 priority on each. The administration justifies this nonmilitary deficit spending on the unproved theory that its annual stimulation of the national gross wealth will make it self-liquidating before it can become inflationary. And this calculation is based on an even shakier theory—that "real income" is produced by Government spending and private spending alike, despite the fact that the former can spend only what it subtracts from the latter.

The administration evaluates the spread of international communism to West Berlin, Asia and Africa as a menace which must be resisted by positive and aggressive measures, including military ones if these are required to make the resistance effective and are technically feasible. But its policy is wholly passive toward Cuba, where the Castro government is becoming more and more closely allied with Moscow and by covert and open acts is working on other Latin American peoples to follow its lead. Yet no military base which the United States maintains on the Russian periphery as a deterrent to Soviet attack on the West is nearer, or in war more dangerous potentially, to the Soviet Union than Cuba is to the United States.

The President in person has notified Premier Khrushchev that we will use force if necessary to support our occupation rights and protect the people in West Berlin against his plan to make it a free city, with access facilities transferred to East Germany. But while, in this grim showdown, our rights ultimately might survive, West Berlin itself might not. This is a sober military judgment which calls for new but not surrender-type thinking on an awesome problem. However, the only thinking of this kind revealed thus far in administration quarters was Senator MANSFIELD's today—a "free city" composed of the two Berlins with sound guarantees, which he also specified.

In sum, the indecisions of the President and the administration—indecisions either because no policy choice has been made or because two policies are running in conflict—already are fostering, in at least six vital areas of controversy, consequences most suitable to Khrushchev. In the sixth area is the controversy over further prolonging the Geneva test-ban talks.

Although (1) no fallout peril would be created by resuming seismic or even weapons testing underground by the United States, (2) no check on disarmament would be involved because the existing stockpiles already are sufficient to destroy civilization, (3) and members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the associated joint congressional committees are urging that at a minimum test preparations be made at once, the President continues to hesitate.

He has been persuaded that world opinion would not understand why test resumption as a measure of vital security has been forced on the United States by the Soviet Union. Strange that this speculation should so much influence a President with his powers

of statement, an ironclad case and reports from qualified sources that there are at least 200 seismic events a year in Soviet territory.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 15, 1961]

BERLIN: A THIRD WAY

In his search for a "third way" in Berlin, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD rests his case on the unassailable premise that the deadlock there may "push the Western nations and the Soviet Union into a new vortex of irrationality at whose center lies the graveyard of humanity." Those on both sides who say they want to stand pat on Berlin, come what may, should give serious consideration to this prospect.

We do not know whether Senator MANSFIELD's remarks were of the inspired "trial balloon" variety, or whether he was speaking on his own responsibility. And perhaps it doesn't matter. The important thing is that his speech makes sense.

As matters stand, both the West and the Soviet Union are adhering to irreconcilable positions. These positions take little account of the changes in Europe since the end of World War II, some 16 years ago. And they are also positions which, far from serving real interests, promise nothing better to all concerned than the frightful consequences of a nuclear collision.

In this situation, the Montana Senator calls for the taking of a new look—a search for a third way in Berlin. Specifically, he thinks that this third way may lie in the creation of a free city which would encompass not just West Berlin, but all of Berlin. This free city would be "held in trust and in peace by some international authority" until such time as it can again serve as the capital of Germany, and its access routes would be garrisoned by international peace teams. Meanwhile, the hope would be that the East and the West Germans could work out their own unification problem.

Of course, all of this may be wishful thinking. Senator MANSFIELD does not pretend to know how Mr. Khrushchev would react to such a proposal, if it were put to him in formal fashion, and there is little in the record to encourage belief that the Soviet Premier would respond favorably. Still, as the majority leader has stated, uncertainty as to Mr. Khrushchev's reaction does not relieve us of the obligation to explore any and all avenues of peace "even as we steel ourselves for what must come if the way to peace cannot be found."

What is at stake here is the future of mankind—most certainly including Americans, Russians and Germans. Even so, we cannot yield to unilateral action designed to force us out of Berlin. If Mr. Khrushchev will concede nothing, then we—and he—must accept the consequences. But such a disaster should not be called down upon the human race simply because an obsessive attachment to old and outdated positions precludes examination of rational alternatives.

[From the Great Falls Tribune, June 17, 1961]

MANSFIELD'S FREE CITY PLAN FOR BERLIN MAKES GOOD SENSE

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD'S proposal that all of Berlin be turned over to an international trusteeship as a free city makes good sense. That would be a practical solution to the renewed threat of a suicidal East-West arms conflict over the Berlin trouble spot, now building up.

MANSFIELD'S warning that "we are not engaged in Berlin with the fast draw and TV wax bullets any more than the Russians are engaged in a harmless game of chess" is in line with President Kennedy's report on his exchange of views on Berlin with Khrushchev at Vienna.

As the President put it: "Our most somber talks were on the subject of Germany and Berlin."

Kennedy reaffirmed the U.S. determination to maintain at any risk Western access routes to West Berlin and the freedom of the city's 2 million inhabitants.

Khrushchev, in turn, was emphatic in expressing his determination to change the existing arrangement at Berlin.

As MANSFIELD sees it, "sooner or later the Western nations and the Soviet Union must seek a new way"—an alternative to war—for settlement of the Berlin controversy. Few informed observers disagree with his further statement that unless a search for settlement is pursued with energy and dispatch, sooner or later, "Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster to mankind."

[From the Providence Evening Journal, June 17, 1961]

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S PLAN TO EASE THE BERLIN CRISIS

As a counter to the Kremlin's demand that West Berlin be turned into a free city under United Nations protection, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD has revived his proposal that the free-city status be applied to all Berlin.

This approach to the future of the former German capital, now split in two by the cold war and the source of a new crisis threat, has not excited any more cheers in Bonn than it did the first time Senator MANSFIELD advanced it 2 years ago. Indeed, the proposal has been greeted in West Germany with even more dismay than in 1959 since in the interim Mr. MANSFIELD has become Senate majority leader, exercising greater influence than before.

From one point of view, the West German perturbation has some basis in fact. Any attempt to reunite the East and West sectors of Berlin, one side a free society supported economically by the West and the other side totally communized, poses almost as many practical problems as the reunification of Germany itself.

Indeed, the chances of the Soviet Union's accepting the idea are slight since the Kremlin designated East Berlin as the capital of the Communist East German Government and would be reluctant to remove Ulbricht's headquarters from the city which still is the emotional capital of all Germans.

Yet no move could be devised to break the dangerous deadlock over Berlin that did not arouse substantial objections. In contrast, Senator MANSFIELD'S proposal has several significant virtues.

Khrushchev, whether intentionally or not, has turned Berlin into a powder keg by demanding, in the form of successive near-ultimatums, that the Western Big Three retire from West Berlin, which he has characterized as a "bone in the throat" of the Communist bloc that must be removed.

He sharpened the ultimatum in his meeting with President Kennedy in Vienna and in his fireside chat to the Soviet people. It will be increasingly hard for him not to deliver something in the near future. Thus, Western insistence on the status quo for West Berlin helps to keep Khrushchev on his collision course.

The Mansfield idea, on the other hand, would end the status quo and take the Big Three stamp off West Berlin. Yet, it would wring a matching concession from the Soviet Union by forcing the ouster of the Ulbricht government from East Berlin and restoring the organic unity of the city.

Thus, a change of status, satisfying an acute Soviet need, would be achieved, but the withdrawal from Berlin would be mutual. One-sided concession by the West, demanded by the Kremlin, which would be a disastrous and intolerable defeat for the Atlantic community and free world, would be voided. Further, the danger of war over Berlin, now a very real potential, would be avoided for a few more years, giving the cold war antagonists time to negotiate their critical differences.

At least, the proposal offers a talking point, beyond the Soviet demands, and that is more than anyone or any nation in the Western coalition has come up with yet.

The idea is worth exploring further, even if it turns out only as a gambit that would place the Kremlin in the position of dog in the manger, and take the West off the defensive in the propaganda war over Berlin and Germany.

[From the Washington Star, June 15, 1961]

GOP HEADS QUERY POLICY ON BERLIN

Republican leaders said yesterday the country is entitled to know whether the proposal of Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD to have all of Berlin declared a free city under international control indicates any change in the foreign policy of the Kennedy administration.

Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN and House Republican Leader HALLECK said that when President Kennedy returned from his Vienna meeting with Soviet Premier Khrushchev he made positive statements that this country's position on Berlin had not been changed and that the United States would stand by its existing rights in West Berlin.

But Mr. HALLECK said it is hard to conclude that speeches in the Senate yesterday by Senator MANSFIELD and other Democrats were "made out of a clear sky."

Senator DIRKSEN said he got the impression the remarks of both Democratic Leader MANSFIELD and his assistant, Senator HUMPHREY, were trial balloons to get the reaction of the American people.

Advised of their statements, Senator MANSFIELD said he made his suggestion "entirely on my own" and the administration "had nothing whatever to do with it."

"I didn't even send copies of it to the President or the State Department," Senator MANSFIELD told reporters. "It was not a trial balloon, but a development of suggestions I have been making for many months."

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 15, 1961]

EAST GERMANY ISSUES CALL FOR PEACE TREATY MEETING

LONDON, Thursday, June 15.—Communist East Germany has demanded that West Germany ban all rallies in a 3-mile-wide zone along the border between the two Germanys, especially demonstrations on June 17, anniversary of the 1953 anti-Communist uprising in East Germany.

(By Bynum Shaw, Bonn Bureau of the Sun)

BONN, June 14.—Communist East Germany today issued an appeal to the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia for the convocation of a conference to conclude a German peace treaty.

The appeal, aimed at the beginning of talks on a peace treaty with "both parts of Germany" also called for a "normalization of the situation in West Berlin."

West Berlin at present is occupied by the United States, Britain, and France. The fourth part of the city, that which under wartime agreements was occupied by the Soviet Union, now has been turned over to East Germany. Communist appeals for normalization never include that portion of the city in the text.

Today's East German resolution was approved by the Communist Central Committee, the State Council, the Council of Ministers, and the National Front. In all of these organizations except the National Front, Walter Ulbricht, former Red army colonel, is the dominant figure. The resolution said the Bonn Government for years

has evaded all proposals based on peaceful understanding.

It said Bonn now faces a decision of "truly historic importance."

In Bonn, a Government spokesman shrugged off the East German proposal as "parrot talk."

The spokesman said there is no reason to believe that the Western Powers are retreating before Soviet Premier Khrushchev's Vienna demands.

Government officials also were studying a proposal by U.S. Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, calling for the creation of a free city of Berlin which would include not only the Western but also the Eastern sectors of the city.

While criticizing MANSFIELD'S contention that Berlin for the West is an untenable position, these sources welcome the possibility of a reestablishment of Greater Berlin as a unit.

Officials pointed out that in 1950 West Germany had proposed free elections for all of Berlin and the creation of an elective council perhaps under four-power supervision for the operation of the city as a whole.

JUDICIARY BILL GETS AN OK

There is no hope here, however, that the Soviet Union would relinquish an inch of territory in the hope of gaining more.

Meanwhile, in Bonn, the Bundestag approved a bill which redefines the status of the West German judiciary.

The bill would allow 72 judges who served under the Hitler regime and are known as "hanging judges," to ask for retirement in the next year.

If they retire voluntarily, they will retain full pension rights even if they are not yet at the pensioning age of 65, if they decline to accept this easy way out, they later will be removed from office through a change in the Constitution.

The enforced retirement would deprive the judges of pension rights.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, June 16, 1961]

PRELUDE TO RETREAT?

This week's speech by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Democratic floor leader in the Senate, is illustrative of one of the gravest weaknesses in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy since the end of World War II.

Senator MANSFIELD, who is normally the administration's spokesman on such matters, suggested as a third alternative that the Berlin crisis be solved by converting the prewar German capital into a free city governed by an unnamed international authority.

The Mansfield proposal is strikingly like Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's longtime advocacy of United Nations control of Berlin. In view of the dismal record of the U.N. as an impartial arbiter in the Congo, a U.N. mandate in Berlin would be tantamount to a total surrender to the Soviet Union and its East German satellite.

Quite apart from its basic unsoundness, there are two particularly amazing features in the Mansfield plan for Berlin.

First of all, Senator MANSFIELD told the Senate that he was speaking simply as one lawmaker. But a majority leader never speaks as a mere lawmaker. Whether he wants to be or not, he is armed with the prestige that his role as an administration spokesman affords him. Every word he utters, consequently, will be interpreted throughout the world as having at least the foreknowledge of the White House.

Secondly, Senator MANSFIELD could scarcely have chosen a less opportune time to suggest that the United States is thinking of a Berlin retreat. Too often in the past, we have approached an international crisis apparently united, apparently committed, apparently determined not to backtrack. And at that crucial moment, someone steps forward with an intimation that the United States might settle for far less than its official spokesmen have sought. This procedure is like advertising in advance that we don't mean what we say. Our enemies are encouraged to stand pat, to enlarge their demands.

The entire U.S. position in Berlin rests on the occupation agreement concluded between the Big Four at the end of World War II. We have been insisting all along that the Russians fulfill their obligations under that compact and that they permit the Western Powers to fulfill theirs.

Entering into any new agreement would immediately nullify the 1945 agreement. Our rights in Berlin would be wiped away. So would the obligations of the Russians.

Nothing, we think, would please Khrushchev more.

The administration should lose no time in repudiating a surrender in Berlin and in seeking to repair the damage that inevitably accompanied the Mansfield proposal. Even with such a disavowal from the White House, the Western position will be seriously impaired.

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 16, 1961]

NO MERIT IN MANSFIELD PLAN

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD'S proposal that all Berlin be turned over to an international trusteeship as a free city immediately raises a question. Does President Kennedy approve?

Only recently the President said flatly, "We will fight for Berlin."

Then, at the summit conference, Khrushchev slammed the issue of West Berlin down on the table and issued an ultimatum to the Western Powers to get out of the city within 6 months.

While this now appears to have been the most important thing that happened at the conference, the President did not mention it in his report to the Nation. This creates speculation as to whether the suggestion of the Senate Democratic leader is a move to open the way for the President to back down from his bold statement, "We will fight for Berlin."

MANSFIELD'S proposal is utterly without merit. It would merely strengthen Soviet Russia. The original proposal for administration of Berlin was through a four-power agency, including Russia. But Russia would never cooperate and has schemed constantly to put Berlin under Communist control. This would be Russia's strategy under any such program as MANSFIELD now suggests.

Russia desperately wants control of West Berlin because that city is a constant exhibit of Western freedom against Soviet slavery. A large majority of West Berlin citizens have been constantly loyal to the West. To desert them would be a cowardly retreat by the Western Powers. This would depreciate their prestige with the nations of the world more than anything else that has been done. The President should immediately voice his opposition to the Mansfield proposal. The Senate should turn it down.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, June 16, 1961]

THE FUTURE OF BERLIN

Premier Khrushchev has now served warning, for the third time, that the problem of Berlin and a divided Germany must be solved within a fixed period of time.

In 1958 he set the limit at 6 months, but took no action to implement his threat. Last year he fixed the new limit as "in 1961." Now he has repeated this warning, in a speech to the Russian people reporting on his Vienna meeting with President Kennedy.

His speech contained little that was new, and his manner was not bellicose. He simply restated the Russian conditions for a settlement—utterly unacceptable to the West—but he stated them with a firmness that left little doubt that East and West this year will see a test of courage and determination centering on Berlin.

His speech confirms President Kennedy's report that the meeting at Vienna was a somber one. What is worse, it gives little support to the one hope that President Kennedy brought home: that as a result of the meeting the chances for a dangerous misjudgment on either side should now be less.

The President's principal concern at Vienna was to impress upon Khrushchev that the West is in deadly earnest in declaring its intention of defending its rights in Berlin, and will take whatever steps are necessary to meet its commitments to the free people in West Berlin.

If Khrushchev was impressed, or his plans altered, by the Vienna meeting, his address to the Russian people did not show it. He seems convinced that the West will, when the chips are down, retreat from its firm position.

If he continues to hold to this view and acts upon it, President Kennedy and our Western allies will be compelled to find means of showing him that he is still misjudging the West; or make an ignominous retreat which would be interpreted throughout the world as meaning that the cold war is lost.

FLIRTING WITH APPEASEMENT

President Kennedy's difficulties, in showing that the West will not retreat at Berlin, have been complicated meanwhile by the fact that Senator MIKE MANSFIELD has now proposed, for the second time, exactly such a solution for Berlin.

The danger doesn't lie in the scheme itself, since it's not likely to get far. What's dangerous is the fact that it has been put forth by the Senate majority leader, and that some of our European allies (and perhaps Russia) are already wondering if it is a trial balloon sent up by the administration.

Senator MANSFIELD proposes that East and West Berlin should be unified in a single free city, which could better be called a defenseless city. It would be held in trust by an international authority. Both Soviet and Western garrisons would be withdrawn, and the city and its access routes would be guarded by international peace teams.

The bugs in his plan are dragon size. Khrushchev, for one thing, has repeatedly declared of late that he will insist on a three-sided makeup for any major international control group, with a built-in Soviet veto to paralyze its work. If this were agreed to here, Berlin would be gone in a day.

Senator MANSFIELD has ignored some important questions: How long would West Berlin remain free if its freedom depended on the determination of international troops from, say, India, to resist aggression or encroachment by Russia's East German puppets? Does he seriously believe that the Soviet Union is prepared to let East Berliners and East Germans be suddenly exposed to all the freedoms and prosperity now enjoyed by West Berliners? If he does, he is entitled without contest to the Pollyanna medal of 1961.

Senator MANSFIELD puts forth his plan as a third way to avoid dangers growing out of the rigid positions taken by Russia and the West.

His language suggests that both sides are being stubbornly unreasonable.

The fact is that the West is standing on agreements reached with the Soviet Union in 1944. The Soviets are threatening to violate them, to gobble up Berlin and one-third of Germany. The difference is like that between the rigid positions of an honest citizen and the robber, who, at the point of a gun, demands his purse.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 16, 1961]

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S INVITATION TO MISCALCULATE

Senator MANSFIELD's proposal for making a free city of Berlin was prompted, no doubt, by that irresistible desire to be helpful which frequently animates Members of Congress when they happen to ponder great international problems.

Whether from vanity or discretion, he insists that this is his own idea, and not that of an administration whose majority he leads in the Senate.

But surely had he stopped to think, Senator MANSFIELD might have considered the immediate background of events against which this proposal was paraded. President Kennedy's meeting with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna disclosed that Berlin is to be the target of a fresh onslaught by Soviet diplomacy.

The fact that the Senate majority leader openly suggests a Berlin solution radically different from the position taken by the West, and halfway toward Mr. Khrushchev's own, is a serious diplomatic blunder.

We may be all too used to Senators speaking only for themselves, but nobody else is. Indeed, one of the oldest ruses of diplomacy is to characterize as purely personal something which is later to be unmasked as official. We cannot blame Mr. Khrushchev, or even Dr. Adenauer, if they see a trial balloon in Mr. MANSFIELD's suggestion. Nor will the foolish impracticability of its details influence their judgment; trial balloons, after all, are not meant to stay aloft very long.

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1961]

THE TROUBLES KHRUSHCHEV SELDOM MENTIONS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—There is an odd distortion in Premier Khrushchev's report today on his Vienna talks with President Kennedy.

In discussing what the West might do if Moscow made a separate peace treaty with the Communist regime of East Germany, he said: "Some threaten they will not recognize the treaty and will use force to oppose it. Any force against us will be answered by force. We have the means."

This is odd because President Kennedy personally reassured Mr. Khrushchev on this point in Vienna. He drew a sharp distinction between the legal aspects of signing a treaty with East Germany and the practical problem of getting supplies through to West Berlin.

The President emphasized that the United States would continue to meet its obligations to supply the 2,200,000 people of West Berlin, by force if necessary, but that it was not particularly concerned about who stamped the papers at the East Berlin border, just so the supplies went through.

Nevertheless, in his fireless-side chat tonight, the Soviet leader set up the strawman and threatened to use force under circumstances which the President had told him would not occur. In fact, when President Kennedy went on to London from Vienna, the point was repeated that the Western nations were not going to war over the color of the stamp on scraps of paper but that they were determined to get the supplies through.

Khrushchev, however, is setting the stage for summoning a big peace conference on Germany at the October meeting of the Communist parties. Washington won't like this and won't participate in such a conference, but nobody here is going to mobilize the troops to bang through Helmstedt toward West Berlin just because the Soviet leader needs to sign a peace treaty with East Germany for internal Communist reasons.

Having had previous problems with his own allies, President Kennedy understands Mr. Khrushchev's political problems. There is plenty of trouble in the Communist paradise. Their agricultural policies have been a spectacular failure. This was supposed to be Khrushchev's specialty when he came to power, but it has been his greatest disappointment. In China the food situation is desperate and may prove by the end of this year to be the biggest flop and tragedy of 1961.

One result of this is that China is constantly pressing the Soviet Union for more supplies than Moscow wishes to give and at the same time challenging Khrushchev's ideological and political leadership.

All is not well for Khrushchev in other places either. His dreams of conquest in the Middle East have not materialized. Nasser has turned on him and vice versa. Iraq has not fallen into his lap as the Communist brethren anticipated. Albania has been defying Moscow and forced Khrushchev to dismantle his submarine base in that country.

In fact, Khrushchev's whole campaign to establish a three-headed control of international machinery is a direct result not of Soviet successes recently but of a spectacular Soviet defeat in the Congo, where the U.N. forced the Communists out.

It is no wonder Khrushchev wants to prepare the way for at least the impression of a victory at the big Communist blowout in October. In Communist terms, his record is not one of unrelieved success. He is picking up some easy victories in Laos and other places close to Soviet borders, but his difficulties with Peiping, Cairo, and Albania, his failure to get the supplies anticipated from East Germany, the increasing pressure for more food and freedom in Eastern Europe and even in the Soviet Union itself—all these make his life less serene than it sometimes appears to be in the West.

Thus, his threats to use force in Germany sound brave enough but actually mean very little. If he really wants to show how brave he is, all he has to do is to encourage the East Germans to block the supply routes to Berlin, and then he will have a test of courage that will make Stalingrad look like a tea party.

For this Government is not thinking of making all of Berlin a free city, no matter what Senator MIKE MANSFIELD says, and it is not thinking of war to keep Khrushchev from signing a peace treaty with East Germany.

It is merely saying that it will not abandon the West Berliners; that it will supply them no matter who stamps the papers, and it is advising Khrushchev not to let the supplies be stopped unless he wants to risk everything achieved by the Soviet revolution in the last 40 years.

[From the New York Daily News, June 16, 1961]

APPEASEMENT AND DEFEATISM

—to come out for a new Berlin setup that has the mackerel-in-the-moonlight smell of appeasement and defeatism.

It is the Montana Democrat's (and Senate majority leader's) thought that, pending unification of Germany, all Berlin should be trusted to some international authority, with entrances and exits kept open by peace forces like those which have prevented war between Israel and Egypt but have not prevented persistent unrest in the former Belgian Congo.

Such a rejiggering in Berlin would obviously open the whole city to conquest by Communist mobs, with the Red army backing them up, unless the peace forces were big enough to beat back the Russian legions.

By agreeing to it, the Western allies would recognize East Germany's Communist "government," at least unofficially, and cause the captive nations to lose all hope of liberation.

Concerning the Mansfield proposal, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, wants to know whether it is a trial balloon indicating that the Kennedy administration now plans to weasel gradually and slyly out of its repeated promises to stand firm on West Berlin.

MANSFIELD says it is not; but, with all due respect to him, it seems to us that what is needed is some reassurance from the President himself. Khrushchev, you'll remember, said long before the 1960 election that he expected to be able to deal with a new U.S. President, whereas he couldn't get to first base with Eisenhower.

[From the Washington Star, June 16, 1961]

WEST GERMANS PROTEST PLAN OF MANSFIELD

BONN, GERMANY, June 16.—The West German Government has come out strongly against the Mansfield proposals for a compromise solution to the Berlin problem.

Foreign Ministry spokesman, Guenther von Hase, told a news conference yesterday the plan would mean deepening the division of Germany and legalizing to a certain degree Communist East Germany. Mr. Hase said West Germany would never agree to this.

U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD had proposed uniting the present Communist and Western sectors of Berlin and creating a unified free city. It would be held in trust by an international organization until Germany is reunified.

Senator MANSFIELD argued in his speech before the Senate that this would be one way to avert the threat of nuclear war that hangs over the Berlin issue because of the seeming impossibility of the United States and the Soviet Union to agree on a solution. He emphasized that he was speaking for himself, not for the administration.

"We are convinced that the Senator put forward this plan with the best of intentions, but we regret that we cannot call it good," Mr. Hase said.

"To follow the plan would mean dividing Germany into three parts," Mr. Hase said, meaning West and East Germany, plus the new free city of Berlin.

The longstanding policy of West Germany is to end the present division of the country through free elections and reestablish Berlin as the national capital.

"The solution of the Berlin problem cannot be treated separately," Mr. Hase said. "Berlin is a part of free Germany and must become the capital of a unified Germany."

Then Mr. Hase bore down on the Mansfield proposal that West Germany and East Germany get together on a new status for Berlin. Mr. Hase said this would give a form of recognition and legalization to Communist East Germany, a step West Germany has firmly opposed. It even refuses to maintain diplomatic relations with countries that extend them to East Germany.

Praise was given Senator MANSFIELD for treating Berlin as a whole, in contrast with Premier Khrushchev. In his memorandum to President Kennedy Mr. Khrushchev demanded that only the western sector of the city be internationalized and demilitarized. The eastern sector would remain the capital of East Germany, fully under Communist control.

Mr. Hase said: "The Senator speaks correctly of the whole of Berlin," but that was all he had good to say about the Mansfield plan.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 16, 1961]

MIKE DENIES FLYING BERLIN BALLOON

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Republican congressional chiefs demanded to know today whether Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's proposal that Berlin be made a

free city was a trial balloon for an administration policy shift.

MANSFIELD promptly denied that his suggestion yesterday in a Senate speech was designed to test public reaction. The Montana Democrat said the speech merely was a compilation of views he and others had expressed previously. MANSFIELD said he had not given an advance copy of his remarks to the White House or the State Department.

Asked about the GOP statement, Associate White House Press Secretary Andrew Hatcher declined comment.

MANSFIELD said yesterday that Russia and the United States must compromise their differences on Berlin or risk nuclear war. He proposed a third way—making East and West Berlin a free city. It would remain under international trusteeship pending German reunification.

WONDER IF IT'S A FEELER

Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and House GOP Chief CHARLES A. HALLECK questioned whether MANSFIELD's statement was a feeler to determine public reaction to any new Berlin policy.

HALLECK said the people are entitled to know "whether there is an official change in our position toward Berlin."

President Kennedy told the Nation after his Vienna meeting with Khrushchev that he emphasized to the Soviet Premier this country's determination to defend its treaty rights and access to West Berlin.

BONN, June 15.—West Germany never would sign a proposal, such as Senator MANSFIELD suggests, to make Berlin a free city under an international trusteeship, a Government spokesman said today.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Karl Gunther Von Hase said that MANSFIELD's suggestion was "incompatible with the inalienable claim of the German people toward reunification and freedom."

Von Hase said East Germany's leaders would have no right to sign such a plan either, since East Germany "is far from sovereign."

MANSFIELD's remarks came as something of a shock in West Germany, where they received banner headlines.

BERLIN, June 15.—East German Communist Leader Walter Ulbricht today openly threatened interference with West Berlin's traffic should a German peace treaty be signed. He hinted that Allied planes would be forced down if they tried another Berlin airlift.

Speaking in East Berlin, Ulbricht advised the United States, Britain and France to start immediate negotiations if they want to travel to Berlin after a treaty is signed. He said road, rail and air traffic would be interrupted unless the West signed agreements with East Germany.

GERMAN RAPS "FREE CITY"

The proposal by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democratic majority leader, to turn Berlin into a free city would make the German metropolis "a city without freedom," Baron Karl T. Guttenberg, member of the German Parliament, declared yesterday. He spoke at Waldorf ceremonies commemorating the 8th anniversary of the East German uprising.

Guttenberg said that replacing the occupying powers—the United States, Great Britain and France—by any international authority would mean setting up an instrument for Eastern intervention.

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1961]

RUMORS OF CONCESSIONS: WEST AGAIN FACES ISSUE OF ACTION ON BERLIN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Once again the United States and its British and French allies face this question over Berlin: should they attempt to stand pat on the present arrangement; should they offer to negotiate but only in a limited way which could lead to no new agreement with the Soviet Union; or should they take the risk of some daring new proposals?

Officially, the United States is standing pat. But everyone who went through the last Berlin crisis, the one precipitated by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's ultimatum of Thanksgiving Day, 1958, assumes the West will go to the conference table once again to avert a military showdown.

The real question, then, is whether the West will again offer some small concessions or whether it will try for a settlement on the basis of some major new proposals.

Yesterday both the State Department and the British Foreign Office flatly denied a London Daily Telegraph report that Western experts were working on a plan in which the West would concede some kind of recognition of Communist East Germany and the present Oder-Neisse border between East Germany and Poland in exchange for a permanent arrangement for free West Berlin.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told newsmen the article was "just not accurate," that he foresaw no change in the policy of standing firm on Berlin.

Denials to the contrary notwithstanding, it is a fact that there has been at least discussion—some time back, not just since Khrushchev's demand for a German peace treaty in 1961—of this very idea. How far it has gone is unknown but it is a fact that some very important persons in the administration have at least scouted the idea as a possibility.

The State Department also took pains to knock down the idea that Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's Wednesday speech, calling for establishment of a free city composed of both East and West Berlin, was an administration trial balloon.

MANSFIELD has said he was talking entirely on his own. In fact he avoided telling anyone in the administration in advance lest they try to argue him out of making it. His point was to get discussion going.

These are not the only people in Washington talking about a bold approach to the Berlin issue. Columnist Walter Lippmann alluded to it on a television interview Thursday night.

Where it will come out is now totally uncertain since agreement will be necessary not just among the experts but among President Kennedy, French President Charles de Gaulle and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan. Their current posture is to "stand firm."

Today in West Berlin there will be a massive rally, called by Mayor Willy Brandt, to give the West Berliner's answer to Khrushchev. It will be the eighth anniversary of the abortive 1953 East Berlin and East German uprising, an uprising crushed by Soviet military power.

The White House yesterday had no comment on Khrushchev's radio-television speech of Thursday though the President received a transcript of the text.

[From the New York Mirror, June 17, 1961]

ARE WE READY?

In the teeth of the Khrushchev ultimatum, the free world must make a choice. Its nations must stand up and be counted.

There is no "third way."

For if a third way is to be entertained, the way proposed by Senator MANSFIELD, for instance, to the disservice of his country, in our opinion, then there is to be more compromise and appeasement.

The time for all that is past.

This may be our last chance.

Khrushchev's ultimatum is that there must be a German peace treaty on his terms by the end of this year, December 31, 1961.

This means a treaty agreement between East and West with both Germanys or a unilateral treaty on Communist Russia's part with Communist East Germany.

It is not enough to say that we must call Khrushchev's bluff; we must stand firm even at the risk that he is not bluffing.

But is this a time for utter pessimism? We believe not. All the cards are not in Khrushchev's hands, for—

We hold some aces on our own side, if we've got the guts to play out the game—we and our allies.

Our advantage lies in the enemy's weakness; he is weak in many ways.

1. The Russian people, with whom we have no quarrel, insistently are demanding more of the fruits of peace, more of the good things of life which communism promised and never gave.

2. We are in West Berlin by right and treaty.

3. The only solution of the so-called German problem is by free, supervised elections conducted throughout all Germany. The world should be reminded continually that Soviet Russia agreed to elections—and reneged.

4. West Berlin, an enclave within East Germany, has become the world's brightest showcase of freedom. By thousands each week, refugees flee to its sanctuary from the Communist surroundings.

5. More important than all else is the economic power which we, and to a greater extent our allies, hold over the Communist heartland and its subverted satellites. Are we and our allies ready to take a decisive step now and cut off all trade with communism and its bullyragging leader? Therein lies a positive and powerful reply to Khrushchev.

All trade means all in both directions. It means not only the strategic goods but the nonstrategic as well—the "soft" goods, the luxury items, the machine tools (how can they be called nonstrategic), the food, the loans, the grants, etc. It means we should buy nothing from Russia or any other Communist land, no oil, no furs or raw materials, no gourmet's delights such as caviar and Polish hams, no geegaws for the Christmas trees, or felt hats, pocketbooks, leather goods—anything.

It is with the hard currencies Russia gains from her trade with the West that she finances propaganda, subversion, espionage, riots in which the mobs and students are paid performers. That money should be cut off.

Such a program would call for courage, for patriotism ahead of profit; for survival ahead of greed.

Are we ready to stand up? Are our allies ready?

The chance to answer the questions affirmatively may never come again.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1961]

WESTERN DIFFERENCES

As to the possibility of negotiating a new agreement on Berlin, there have been differences in the West. The British have leaned toward flexibility on negotiating a new agreement, while the West Germans have spoken strongly against any compromise.

Talk of a "new approach" to the problem was heard in the Senate where Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD repeated a proposal he has made before. It calls for making all Berlin a free city to be held in trust by an international authority, and for garrisoning the access routes with international peace terms.

The proposal aroused speculation that Mr. MANSFIELD was sending up a trial balloon for the administration, but he insisted he was speaking only for himself. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in an effort to counter suspicion that a revision of policy might be in

the making, declared there had been no change in the U.S. determination to stand firm on its rights in West Berlin and to protect the city's people.

Perhaps the strongest comment of the Khrushchev proposals came from Dirk U. Stikker, the new Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, who accused the Soviet Premier of deliberately provoking tension. Dr. Stikker said: "We must make up our minds about what we are ready to do."

Thus it appears the anti-Communist alliance will face a stern test of nerves and will in the next few months.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1961]

GERMAN UNITY CRY HAS WEAKER SOUND—HOPES FOR A FREE, UNDIVIDED COUNTRY ARE DIMMED BY THE INCREASED PRESSURE FROM KHRUSHCHEV

(By Gerd Wilcke)

BONN, GERMANY, June 17.—Today is National Unity Day in West Germany and West Berlin and hundreds of thousands of free Germans are gathering to commemorate the uprising 8 years ago of the population of East Germany against Communist rule.

In essence, the words spoken at today's rallies are similar to those used last year and the years before. But the cry for unity has attained a hollow sound. As one of the more responsible newspapers of West Germany put it this week:

"We will commemorate the day as we did in the past 7 years. But next year's June 17 will not be the same. We can predict this without resorting to crystal balls. It is self-explanatory because Premier Khrushchev has left no doubt that he is determined to settle the German and Berlin questions before the end of the year."

The editorial and other written and spoken comment on this "Tag der Einheit" reflect a far greater sense of reality than Germans were willing to subscribe to in the past. Although used to propagandistic pinpricks from the East there is, after Premier Khrushchev's Thursday speech, a greater conviction among Germans that he means business.

GERMAN DOUBTS

At the same time there is an increasing lack of conviction that the West means business to the same degree. As one German put it: "The impact of Premier Khrushchev's radio and television address was great here not because he said anything new but because he said it after seeing the American President."

Although Germans admired the firm way President Kennedy presented the West's case in Vienna, they are not entirely convinced that the President will stick it out.

They read with amazement of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's suggestion for a compromise in Berlin. Although they cannot be certain from this distance whether Senator MANSFIELD reflects the President's views, they are certain that he represents a current of thought.

What will happen if the Russians put through their plan?

In Vienna President Kennedy was extremely forthright in telling Premier Khrushchev what the Western allies were ready to do to maintain their access to Berlin. But the feeling is that the President did not make clear enough what the West would do if the Russians sign a separate peace treaty with Communist East Germany.

This, it is felt, provided Premier Khrushchev with an important opening that could allow him to sign a treaty without fear that the West would offer any vigorous military response.

Now the prospect is that Premier Khrushchev will call a conference before the year is out to proceed with a treaty for East Germany. The West, as has been indicated, will ignore the conference.

Once the treaty is signed, Germans feel, a period of quiet may follow to settle nerves and allow the West to get accustomed to the idea before the squeeze is put on. The squeeze could take several forms.

First the East Germans could demand the right to stamp the papers of the Western allies using the access routes to Berlin.

PERSONNEL CHECKS

Even if the West took the view that it would not be worth while to go to war over rubber stamps or even if the late John Foster Dulles' theory was followed—that the East Germans were merely acting as agents of the Soviet Union—the question of East Germans checking on allied personnel would be a ticklish one.

Then, as East Germany's Communist Chief Walter Ulbricht discussed in his news conference this week, there is the question of air safety over Berlin.

The Russians could someday withdraw their representative from the allied air control center and send an East German instead. The West would have to take a stand immediately. Aside from the military needs, it would have to consider the safety of the 100-odd commercial planes that touch on Berlin every day.

Then there are the more than 2 million Berliners who have remained free because they had the protection of the allies. A cutoff from West Germany would bring back old hardships even if a new airlift—if that is still feasible—would keep open a lifeline.

Although present supplies of vital foodstuffs, coal, building materials, gasoline and so forth are so huge that West Berliners could get by for up to a year, immediate problems would arise in other fields.

Because the city is not self-sufficient Bonn pumps about 1,500 million deutsche marks ($375 million) into Berlin each year. Bonn also buys more than 60 percent of the city's manufactured products.

If the money were cut off, the city's budget would be unbalanced and it would have no funds to extend business credits, pay old-age pensions or restitutions to Nazi victims.

An isolation of Berlin also would shut the gateway of the thousands of East Germans who seek refuge in the West every month. Herr Ulbricht calls the refugee camps "spy nests" of the Western allies. For those who go there the reception centers are the last ray of hope that there still is freedom and human dignity.

DECISION NEEDED

The squeeze on Berlin, which for the Soviet camp would be a step-by-step fight to gain recognition for East Germany, could go on indefinitely but surely a point would come where the West would have to decide how much it wants to take.

One cannot judge from here where this point is as it involves the great unknown of the West's contingency planning going on in Western capitals.

But this much is clear. Premier Khrushchev's apparent conviction that he can get away with a separate peace treaty and its consequences for Berlin despite allied warnings has made a deep impression on Germans and has disturbed them.

Although the West has said no to Premier Khrushchev's formula, people here feel that a negative response alone is no policy. What is more, they fear that any compromise on Berlin is the first step out of Berlin.

What weapons can West Germans use to fight a compromise? The biggest, it seems, is the weapon of discouragement.

After the United States, West Germany makes the largest manpower contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If the Germans were to lose faith in the West, the concept of Western defense would go by the board. It also would bring up the danger that a future West German Government might look for its own accommodations with the Russians. It would not be the first time in history.

All this reflects a great turning point in the Germans' thinking. They feel Premier Khrushchev is determined to have things his way. But they ask themselves: "How determined is the West?"

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 16, 1961]

THE BONE IN KHRUSHCHEV'S THROAT

Berlin, the bone Khrushchev says must come out of the Soviet throat, is usually regarded as the one object above all that the United States will not release. Yet a good many Americans have long felt that, because our position there is so awkward and potentially dangerous, some new arrangement needs to be worked out with the Soviets.

The position is awkward and potentially dangerous, as it must be in an enclave 110 miles east of the Iron Curtain. A new arrangement is needed—the kind that would reratify Western rights in West Berlin and make the Soviets and their East German stooges respect them once and for all.

That, however, is not what is usually meant by a new arrangement; increasingly the talk is of a compromise between the Soviet and the United States positions. One of the most thoughtful of such plans in Senator MANSFIELD's for a "third way" out of the Berlin problem which Khrushchev posed once more in his speech yesterday.

Khrushchev proposes that West Berlin be made a free city, detached from West Germany, with East Berlin an integral part of East Germany; in this way he hopes to gain, gradually if not at once, all Berlin. MANSFIELD proposes that the whole city be united as a free city held in trust by an international authority, presumably the U.N. Its status would be guaranteed by NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact satellites; its access routes would be garrisoned by international peace teams.

Like all "third ways" we have so far heard of, this falls short of the requirements of U.S. security. U.N. troops are too easily used for the political purposes of their national masters, as has been notoriously the case in the Congo; they are not safe substitutes for United States, British, and French soldiers in Berlin. Indeed, if Khrushchev were to accept such a proposal, it would be cause for real alarm, for it would mean he saw his dream of grabbing all Berlin coming true.

The reality, we suspect, is that it is all but impossible to negotiate a safe new arrangement with the Soviets along these lines. We are in Berlin by our rights of conquest; we remain by power. But does this make it an intolerable situation?

Let us remember that Berlin is in truth a bone gagging Khrushchev's throat; to that extent, his discomfort should be a comfort to us. West Berlin is the gateway to freedom for millions from the East. It is living proof, day in and day out, of the lie of the Communist promise. No wonder Khrushchev can't stand it. But we can.

Khrushchev is expected to make more trouble in Berlin later in the year—interfering with traffic and a lot of other things. Certainly the harassments and complications he can cause are almost limitless, as we know from the Berlin blockade and lesser annoyances since then. This prospect has led some to fear that he may be able to nibble us out of Berlin, somewhat as he is doing in Laos.

It could happen—but only if we let it happen. Berlin is not Laos. Rightly or wrongly, we let Laos go because everything, including the apathy of the people, seemed against us; and we could let it go without abandoning all Asia. In Europe, the dividing line was long since clearly drawn, and Berlin is the outpost. Our determination

to defend Berlin represents nothing more nor less than our determination to defend Western Europe and America.

With that resolve, we can meet Khrushchev's provocations, whatever they may be. And if he should throw at us the ultimate provocation of war, then we must face that in the realization only surrender could have averted it. The worst thing that could happen to America is not war but the despairing notion that nothing is worth fighting for. The firmer we are, the less chance of war.

Fundamentally, Berlin is Khrushchev's problem, not ours. Let him push and prod, nibble and seek to negotiate us out; we need only stand fast. It is not up to us to offer new arrangements to accommodate his greed; it is up to him to begin acting civilized.

If he ever should, then it might be possible to make a safe and more peaceful settlement of the status of Berlin. But if he persists in belligerence, our first duty is to make clear there is no third way out of our commitment to freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had occasion to comment last week that I thought the distinguished Senator from Montana had rendered a very distinct public service in making the statement he did on the Berlin situation. I can say as much for my distinguished friend from New Hampshire, the senior Republican in this body. The problem discussed by these Senators which seems to loom on the horizon, and which takes on the dimensions of a crisis, is, after all, a symbol of the much larger problem which I think confronts the entire free world. Probably I could express it by paraphrasing the title of a book which was published last year and which had considerable currency. I believe the title was "When the Kissing Had To Stop." One can paraphrase that by saying, "When the Nibbling Had To Stop," for if one goes back to the beginning of our relationships with the Soviet Union in 1933 one finds, in essence, a pattern of nibbling constantly at the whole free world.

Those present who are familiar with that period recall the exchange of 11 letters between Maxim Litvinov and the then incumbent Roosevelt administration. We thought we had finally contrived an agreement and understanding which, among other things, included stout pledges that there should be no interference with the free system of this country. However, hardly had the ink dried before espionage, subversion, and intrusion into the affairs of this country by the agents of the Soviet Union started; and it has continued from that day to this.

Over the weekend I had occasion to devote a great deal of time to the chronological summary of our relationships with the Soviet Union. When that record is taken apart, it reveals one grand, relentless, and incessant process of nibbling at the free world. The process began by pressures upon the small group of Baltic countries from which has been taken the right of self-determination. I refer particularly to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Among other things, the process included the intrusion of Russia into the upper reaches of Iran. It included the pressure that the Soviet-dominated fronts put upon all the countries of Eastern Europe—Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, and all the rest. The process included the differences we had with the Soviet Government with respect to the so-called Lublin Committee, which was undertaking to develop free elections in Poland. It did not prevail. The nibbling process continued, and finally Poland came under the Red heel.

The process has continued to this hour; and we see it in Laos. As I recall, there was an understanding that Red arms should never be delivered into Laos. I regard the air ferry and the airlift, whether from China or the Soviet Union, or whether in the name of Vietnam forces in North Vietnam, as a distinct violation of the pledge and agreement that was entered into, and for practical purposes everyone now concedes that Laos is pretty well down the drain. The pressures are now on Vietnam, a country with roughly 11 million people in the north section under Red domination, and another 11 million in the southern part, referred to as South Vietnam. The nibbling process is present in that area.

Recently in Washington I listened to the British Foreign Secretary when he estimated that probably as many as 4,000 small civil administrators and another 4,000 troops were being killed in Vietnam every year by the guerrilla tactics stemming from the northern reaches of the country. The guerrillas are inspired by the leadership of Ho Chi-minh, who received his indoctrination in Moscow. So the nibbling process continues, in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

I raise the question again; and I am confident that people everywhere in the country, even as we quiz ourselves in the cloakrooms of the Senate and discuss this subject, are asking, "When will the nibbling stop?" The nibbling process is in line with the crisis in Berlin that now confronts us.

I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for making a very stout and redoubtable statement on this subject, even as the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] had done previously, to the effect that this is no time for defeat, and no time for retreat. As surely as we grace this Chamber today, our generation has a rendezvous with freedom. As freedom in all sections of the world is nibbled away, we can well ask, "How long will it last?" The inevitable question arises, "When will the nibbling stop?" Only one country in the world can give the necessary leadership to provide the answer, and that country is the United States of America, where freedom is still intact.

I have only one further thing to say. I spent part of the weekend developing some remarks on the subject of the Soviet Union's hottest weapon in the cold war. In my judgment, the hottest weapon of the Soviet Union is oil. I shall ask shortly to have a statement printed in the RECORD as a part of my present remarks, but I shall allude to and interpolate one or two points now.

In 1957 Khrushchev remarked that in 15 years Soviet oil production in the Baku field and in the Volga area would exceed 3 billion barrels, which would surpass U.S. production by 500 million barrels.

Russia has the oil. She has techniques, because she adopted our techniques, research, and development. She operates under no legal restraint. She indulges in price cutting. At present, when the differentials of transportation are calculated and we think in terms of Middle East oil produced by American international companies in the Middle East and laid down in Eastern and Western Europe, we find that we can scarcely compete. But Russia can sell her oil to the satellites for twice what they receive for it from the underdeveloped countries. That is one weapon that Russia possesses.

The second weapon Russia has in the ability to use Soviet oil, production of which is now reaching great proportions, for barter purposes. Since the Soviet oil industry is owned and operated by the Soviet Union, what is obtained by way of barter goes back to the same country, which can dispose of it to its people as it sees fit.

Cuba is an example. Russia made a deal with Cuba, saying, "We will take a million tons of your sugar." What did Castro take? He took some cash, commodities, and Soviet oil. All the oil that Cuba today needs, which is 2 million barrels a month, comes from the Soviet Union.

Of the 90,000 barrels a day that Italy now receives from the Soviet Union, 60,000 barrels a day are on a barter basis for steel pipe, pumping equipment, and other supplies. If one takes the trouble to examine a map showing the pipelines in place in the Soviet Union and those that are planned within the next 4 years, not only to the large centers but to the seaports, he can see that Russia will be delivering by pipeline directly to Poland, East Germany, and other places. So Russia can barter; it can cut prices. It is not harassed by congressional committees investigating monopoly practices or antitrust ventures. There are no committees or legislatures to jump upon Mr. Khrushchev and his minions. They can do precisely as they please.

So oil is becoming the hottest weapon in the cold war, for when a country becomes dependent, and suddenly there comes coercion and the threat, "We will cut off your energy supply," such countries become submissive; and too often the political, social, and economic influence which the Soviet Union is espousing to all the world is imposed.

Today, Finland gets all of its oil from the Soviet Union. What will Finland say when the oil supply is cut off? Norway, Sweden, and Denmark to a considerable degree depend on Soviet oil. So does East Germany. Therefore, as the Soviet oil industry expands and the oil distribution facilities are increased, with the sky the limit, so far as barter and price cutting are concerned, we are confronted with the real threat. This is all a part of the nibbling process against the free world. This is one of those gradual and incessant erosions, but at the end there is the real erosion of freedom as we have known it. The President has emphasized that fact and given

point to the great issue that is before us at the present time. Therefore I am raising this question: At what point must the nibbling stop? That is the real issue that confronts the country and the whole world today.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator realize that so far as American companies producing in the Near East are denied the right to sell oil in Europe, they put additional pressure for the right to bring that oil into the United States, with the result that the oil industry in this country is required steadily to cut back on its capacity to meet our own demand. When a country becomes increasingly dependent on Soviet oil and then has its supply cut off, we no longer have the capacity, as we did during the Suez crisis, to cover the short fall, during a time when the oil is not available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly correct. We either have an oil glut, or employment drops. This is not only true of Eastern Europe, but also of Japan. Under the trade agreement we signed with Japan, in fiscal 1961 Japan will take 10 million barrels of oil. In 1962, it will be 12 million barrels. The ante goes up, Mr. President, and as it does, it becomes a real weapon.

Soviet geological teams are working in Afghanistan and in other countries of Asia. The Soviets are sending refinery equipment and drilling equipment to the Argentine and to Bolivia, and elsewhere. This is a nibbling process in the economic field, Mr. President, and it must be halted. I raise it as a question, because this is merely one item in the long procession of events which started in November 1933, when we recognized the Soviet Union, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, after the Soviet Union made solemn pledges, but which pledges the Soviet Union violated even before the ink on the instrument was dry.

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

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

OIL: SOVIET'S HOTTEST WEAPON IN ECONOMIC COLD WAR

The advance of civilization can be read in the use and application of new forms of energy from the Cave Age until today. From nothing but manpower, men went to animal power, to sail power, to steam power from coal, to electric power from coal, to the power from falling water, to oil power and gas power, and now to atomic power. In this power procession, oil is probably the most important because it is widely diffused over the earth and easily transported.

The Soviet political leaders, engineers, and strategist have discovered the importance of oil as a political and trade weapon and are now earnestly intent on using oil to the full in their conquest of the free world.

First let it be recited that the Soviet Union has oil in abundance. The old Baku area on the Caspian Sea has been supplemented by a large producing area in the Volga-Ural section. More than that, they are increasing the number of exploration teams equipped with techniques and instruments which we have developed and will find new producing areas to tap. In the 4-year period from 1955 to 1959, Soviet exports of crude oil jumped from 21 to 92 million barrels of crude oil and from 38 to 96 million barrels of refined products. Small wonder that Khrushchev boasted to the Supreme Soviet in 1957 that in 15 years the U.S.S.R. would be producing oil at an annual rate of 3 billion barrels, 500 million barrels greater than U.S. production in 1960. They have the oil, they are producing in increasing quantities, and they have the advantage of utilizing all the techniques, instruments, and methods which the U.S. oil industry developed and perfected over a long period of years. Thus, the U.S.S.R. has become the world's number two oil producer.

Along with production, the U.S.S.R. has steadily built up an improved distribution system. This includes not merely tankers to reach foreign markets but pipelines as well. Pipelines in place plus those planned for the next 5 years will provide pipeline service to East Germany and Poland, to Hungary and Czechoslovakia, to Turkey and Mongolia, in addition to seaport service to the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, and the Baltic Sea. Here then is an industry with limitless petroleum resources, increasing production facilities using the very best techniques, and an expanding distribution system which can and will be used as an effective instrument in the cold war.

Just how can oil be a dangerous cold war weapon? In the Soviet Union, oil is a Government-owned industry and is subject only to the direction which the Communist leaders may employ in achieving the political results they have in mind, and from which they have never deviated. There is no congress or legislature to harass it; there is no Government agency to pursue it under tax statutes or antitrust laws; there are no investigations except such as the Red leaders may wish to impose; and there is no limit whatsoever on the trade methods it might employ in order to open foreign markets for Soviet oil; no need to make a profit if the political results are acceptable; no accounting to be made to stockholders; no strikes by labor. It is one complete, uninhibited operation, designed for specific results and directed by iron hands. Given such powers over an industry whose product is not only acceptable in every country on earth but in fact indispensable to virtually all countries, it must become quickly apparent what a threat this can be to the free world.

Consider its indispensability. Oil is the stuff which moves airplanes through the skies and tractors through the fields. It moves autos through the streets and over the countrysides and drives the millions upon millions of hydrocarbon engines which do the everyday work of the world whether it be a power mower, a pump to bring water from the earth, a hoist or compressor, a cream separator or earth-moving truck, a dynamo to generate power, or hundreds of other devices which have lifted human drudgery and multiplied the efficiency of human hands. This is oil, and if the flow of this black gold should suddenly stop, the world would come to a virtual standstill. It is this amazing dependence upon petroleum and its products which gives such effectiveness to oil as a cold war weapon.

What then are the Soviet techniques for expanding the foreign market for Soviet oil and making other countries nearly dependent upon it for the continuing flow of energy derived from oil?

First, it can cut prices sharply to meet or destroy competition. The Soviet oil industry is not restricted by statutes or trade policies. The sky is the limit, if necessary to get the business, and when an oil-purchasing country has become in large part dependent upon Soviet oil, the Soviet Union is in a position to force any social, political, or economic concession under threat of having its energy supply cut off. Today it supplies all of the oil used in Iceland, 95 percent of Finland's requirements, 40 percent of Norway's industrial oil requirements, and 10 percent for Sweden. It is the principal supplier of industrial oils for Denmark and is the major supplier to Italy. It supplies most of the oil required by Eastern Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

Not only can the Soviet oil industry make other countries dependent upon it for energy supplies but can by price reductions ranging from 10 to 20 percent effectively throttle competition by private companies in other lands. This has a twofold effect. It unbalances the efforts of American companies operating in foreign fields to operate at a rate which will keep labor employed but can develop an oil glut which could prove disastrous. Their offer to supply all of India's oil requirements for 20 percent less than any other bidder is a case in point. They also underbid British and American companies for the larger part of Egypt's oil requirements. There you have economic warfare in its most unrefined form.

But the Soviet oil industry has another weapon, barter. There are no laws with which to comply, no restrictions, no obstacles. Merely swap oil for whatever another country has to export which the Soviet Union can use to advantage. It is that easy.

In December of 1960, Japan made a trade agreement with the Soviet Union. By its terms, Japan takes 10 million barrels of oil in 1961 and 12½ million barrels in 1962.

Brazil has cocoa, coffee, and meats. Khrushchev has oil. Khrushchev takes Brazilian commodities and Brazil takes Soviet oil. This agreement involved $100 million.

Castro has sugar, Khrushchev has oil. So its a million tons of sugar over a 5-year period for Soviet oil, cash, and commodities.

The Soviets now supply all of Cuba's needs—2 million barrels per month. Similar arrangements have been made with India and Egypt, with Uruguay and Chile, with Burma and Guinea. They involve all manner of commodities from bananas to copper. And all this means the growth of the Soviet oil business in non-Communist as well as Communist countries.

Nor is this the whole story. Soviet geologists are prospecting for oil in Syria and Pakistan, in Iraq and Afghanistan and Ethiopia, and possibly other areas. The Soviet oil industry has been sending drilling and refinery equipment to Ethiopia, the Argentine, and India. Once established in a country through technicans, equipment, and refinery operations, the political overtones begin to appear.

Much information on this subject was developed by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in conjunction with the Library of Congress and can be found in a committee report released earlier this year (1961).

As a member of this subcommittee and as a member of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of the late Senator O'Mahoney which investigated oil operations by American companies both at home and abroad, I was therefore more than ordinarily interested in a report designated as Information Circular No. 8023 issued by the Bureau of Mines and prepared in the Department of the Interior by Mr. Donald J. Frendzel on the "The Soviet 7-Year Plan for Oil" (1959–65) and issued in 1961.

What heightened my interest was the author's comment appearing on page 15, following table 7 in the report, and as a result I sent a letter to Secretary Udall of the Interior Department which I set out in full:

MAY 25, 1961.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,
The Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has come to my attention the Information Circular No.

8025 from your Department under the byline of Mr. Donald J. Frendzel, dealing with the Soviet 7-year plan (1959–65) for oil.

On page 15 following table 7 of this circular there appears this language in Mr. Frendzel's report: "The foregoing comments have dealt with the possible adverse implications of Soviet oil for the free world. There may be some positive aspects of increased U.S.S.R. oil output and exports: (1) The availability of Soviet oil will increase the economic competition in the sale of oil. (2) The availability of Soviet oil will allow some consumers to become less dependent on Middle Eastern oil."

These two comments by Mr. Frendzel have astonished me some because I was a member of a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator O'Mahoney in the 85th Congress, which made a most extensive investigation of the Middle East oil situation.

It must be obvious to all by now that Soviet oil presents a new danger for the West and for the countries allied with the free world.

First, I point out for your attention the study prepared by the Library of Congress at the request of the Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws.

I serve as a member of that subcommittee and we have sought to point out on the basis of documented facts the danger that lies in the expansion of the Soviet oil industry in the cold war. No later than May 11, 1961, there appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer an article with a New York UPI dateline, under the title of "Crisis Seen For Oil Companies," which is, in fact, a comment on an article by Prof. James F. McDevitt in the Challenge magazine for May 1961, in which Mr. McDevitt points out that the Soviet state oil monopoly is growing like a Frankenstein monster.

Other documentation can be cited, including an article in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Ira H. Cram under the title "Russian Oil: New Danger For the West."

I might call attention also to an article in the New York Times, dated May 21, 1961, under the title "Russian Oil Fuels Industrial Drive."

In view of all this it seems surpassingly strange that an employee of the U.S. Department of the Interior should author an information circular on the Soviet 7-year plan for oil and conclude his study with the suggestion that Soviet oil will increase economic competition and will allow some consumers to become less dependent on Middle Eastern oil.

It would appear to me that these conclusions are indeed not in the national interest of this country nor in the interest of American enterprisers who are willing to go abroad, invest their capital and assume all the risks and hazards in order to develop the oil resources of Middle East lands.

I would like to have some responsive and detailed comment not only on Mr. Frendzel's study and with respect to his background and orientation in this field, but upon the other studies made by various groups in Congress from time to time and their relationship to the Soviet danger and to the development of a prejudicial status for the United States.

Having served on the Oil Investigating Committee and also on the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, I deem this matter of transcendant importance to the well-being and security of the United States at a time when so many feverish forces are at work, and I shall want to make suitable comment on the Senate floor after I have received your response to this letter.

Sincerely,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

First let me comment on Mr. Frendzel's observation that "the availability of Soviet oil will increase the economic competition in the sale of oil." If competition can be regarded as a fair endeavor to secure and hold business through fair prices, quality products, and good service, Mr. Frendzel's statement will not stand up.

In comparison with American international companies one need but point out that the Soviet oil industry can cut prices at will and as much as is necessary, it pays no taxes as such, it pays no royalties, wages are low, it can barter at will and the same government which owns and operates the Soviet oil industry also accepts and disposes of the bartered commodities, it can indulge in price differentials such as $1.89 per barrel of crude oil to free world countries as against $3.02 per barrel to satellites. This is not competition but economic infiltration at any price.

Nor is barter competition when carried on by the Soviet Union. Italy is now the largest non-Communist user of Soviet oil. Of the 90,000 barrels being purchased daily, 60,000 barrels per day over a 5-year period will be paid for with steel tubing, synthetic rubber, diesel engines, and pipeline pumping station equipment. This barter deal prices out at about $1.10 per barrel. This is the equivalent of 85 cents for Persian Gulf oil. This scarcely covers taxes and royalties paid by oil companies to the governments in the Middle East countries.

In the case of sales to developing countries, Russian offers are nearly always politically inspired. Their objective is to pull such countries into the Soviet economic orbit and then to use government-to-government trade contacts to extend and strengthen their political influence. If, for example, a country should have a surplus of some commodity such as coffee or cocoa and Russia is able to dispose of it in its domestic economy, the Soviets are able to hold out an offer which few countries can resist. Since the surplus commodity is absorbed without entering free world markets, it does not depress going market prices. In this case, a country can be said to receive Russian oil for practically nothing. It not only has realized substantial foreign exchange savings, but also has traded a commodity which otherwise would probably have been destroyed or dumped on world markets. This kind of deal puts great pressure on a government to acquiesce to any Soviet demands.

The second point in Mr. Frendzel's report, "the availability of Soviet oil will allow some consumers to become less dependent on Middle East oil" can hardly be regarded as an advantage for the free world. It would be fallacious to regard politically motivated Soviet oil as more secure than oil from the countries in the Middle East. It would be further erroneous to consider that private oil companies are, at the present time, overly dependent on crude oil from the Middle East. The fact is that vast new oil areas are being developed in north and west Africa and that the traditional sources of supply in Latin America continue to provide a substantial part of the petroleum requirements of the free world.

Even during the Suez crisis private oil companies supplied oil to all parts of the free world without serious interruptions. Contrary to the implications in Information Circular No. 8023, Russian oil is quite insecure because, if it serves Soviet political intentions, there is no question in my mind that Soviet oil would be immediately cut off.

Politically motivated Soviet competition puts pressure on posted prices of crude oil in the Middle East countries and Venezuela. It was this kind of pressure that forced the international oil companies in August 1960 to lower posted prices in the Persian Gulf. Soviet price cutting for political purposes, therefore, affects not only consuming areas, but also has an impact on the economies of the Middle East and Venezuela, which, in turn, contributes to political problems there. Unless underdeveloped countries learn to be wary of the short-run benefits of low-priced Soviet crude, there is danger of the pillars coming down under posted prices in all the free foreign producing countries. This could be a serious problem for the West.

Soviet oil prices to countries in the free world are likely to remain low only as long as it suits the political and economic gains of the U.S.S.R. It seems evident that the extortionate prices charged satellite countries by the Soviets indicates that when they have once established a captive market, their low price policies will be thrown into reverse. Similarly, the Soviet use of petroleum as a cold war weapon and the Soviet needs for foreign exchange to buy free world technical processes and industrial equipment will dictate Soviet oil buying policies.

No country can afford to become heavily dependent on Russian oil for its energy supply. Any country which does might well find the supply abruptly turned off, as has happened in the past. With the Russians, everything is seen in terms of political priorities. They will not hesitate to cut short their obligation to supply any country with oil if they find they have higher priority opportunities elsewhere.

Since Soviet oil is sold mainly in the wholesale market, it does not bring with it capital funds for investment in distribution, refining, and marketing facilities in consuming countries. In fact, purchasers of Russian crude and products encourage investments in oil facilities behind the Iron Curtain. On the other hand, the heavy investments of the international companies make a tremendous contribution to the economies of the consuming countries. As a result, tens of thousands of jobs have been created, and hundreds of millions of dollars are generated annually in the form of wages, taxes, and purchases of local supplies and equipment.

The concept that trade in itself is a desirable aim does not apply to trade with the Soviets. There may be a short-run advantage to a free world nation in trading its capital goods for Russian oil. But as soon as the Russians become self-sufficient in a particular line, the Western country finds that it has lost a market. Time after time, the Soviets have purchased equipment, and even entire factories from the West, in order to copy products and processes without regard for patent rights. Oil exports, which provide the Russians with foreign exchange, help make such deals possible. Thus, trade agreements involving Russian oil are not designed to promote trade over a long period. Their purpose is to help the Russians catch up with the West.

One of the greatest threats to the free world from Soviet oil lies in bilateral trade practices, wherein a country such as Italy imports Russian crude to help supply its state-owned marketing outlets in other European countries and in Africa. Such a practice permits Russia to enter free world markets by the back door. Soviet political influence invariably follows Soviet economic penetration. Oil companies attempt to stay out of local politics, whereas Russian state enterprise, by definition, represents a direct political arm of the Soviet Government. A developing country that trades its commodities for Russian oil and technological aid is leaving itself wide open to political infiltration.

Mr. President, I consider it particularly unfortunate that a department of the executive branch of the Government of the United States should issue a report indicating purported benefits in Soviet oil trade at a time when our Government should be raising a warning to our allies. Leaders in oversea

countries may easily misinterpret Mr. President, unfortunately the executive as well as the legislative branches of the U.S. Government are issuing staff studies without realizing that the Government leaders, the public, and the press throughout the world construe those staff studies as either official reports of the Congress or of the executive branch of the Government, as the case may be. In my minority views of 1957, "Report of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate," relating to Middle East oil and the Suez Canal crisis, I stated that it was inappropriate and a departure from long established procedures for staff assistants to prepare papers, especially since the papers contained ill-founded statements, conclusions, and recommendations, which created confused ideas throughout the world, especially in the Middle East and Europe. It became apparent that the world press, as well as the public, had assumed that the papers by staff assistants were the reasoned conclusions by the Senators responsible for conducting the hearings and the full Senate.

I further noted that a Congressional Daily so construed the staff papers in one of its issues and that if attacks of any kind upon American companies holding concessions in the Middle East areas became the foundation for other attacks by Communist forces who seek to gain control of these areas, one way or the other, the end result would inevitably be to jeopardize some of the energy sources of the United States and thereby weaken our national security. This was in 1957, and Mr. President, we have seen the struggle by Soviet Russia for power and control of Middle East areas since that time.

Several prominent newspapers in Lebanon, France, and Italy published front-page stories and headlines to the effect that the U.S. Senate Antitrust Subcommittee concluded that big American oil companies were accused of controlling the Saudi Arabian oil market, when those were not conclusions of the U.S. Senate but merely staff statement erroneously made and without basis of fact.

Mr. President, innumerable cases of Russian use of the Federal Trade Commission staff report on international oil could be cited. This FTC staff report was not adopted by the Federal Trade Commission. However, a report by Tass on the 19th of November 1952 is illustrative of the kind of use made of such documents:

Moscow.—Tass, in Russia Hellschreiber to Europe, November 19, 1952. (New Times article by Dikansky describing the machinations of the international oil cartel).

"A report of the Federal Trade Commission on the international oil cartel was published in Washington, August 25.

"But even the merger figures which the Commission has decided to publish provide a clear enough picture of the control of the economic and political life of all capitalist countries by the oil monopolies, of their plunder of colonial countries, of the active part played by the cartel in the conspiracy against peace and democracy.

"The struggle to refashion and portion out the world for the looting of colonial and dependent countries, which is what the oil monopolies are doing with the direct support of the Governments of the United States and Britain, runs like a red thread right through the history of the past decades."

Such a citation effectively demonstrates the dangers to American interests and to American policy which result from the departure from the long-settled tradition that each report by a Senate committee should have executive consideration by the committee and not be merely reports of its staff. This is to prevent erroneous information and ill-founded statements from being released to the public and then construed as the conclusions and recommendations of the committee itself. The danger is ever present that people outside the United States will assume that the findings and conclusions of the staff are necessarily those of the investigating committee. Too often errors and unsustained conclusions have become imbedded in history to the confusion of the foreign policy of the United States.

It seems to me that it is now incumbent that the United States help oversea countries to see that their long-term interests will be best served by recognizing the full implications of the Soviet trade offensive. This Government should cite the dangers of becoming dependent on the Russians and make certain that the political element in Soviet oil offerings is fully understood by our friends.

Russian oil is not just a competitive threat to the oil industry; it is a new, insidious challenge to all nations that are seeking to maintain their political and economic independence.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not wish this debate to end without expressing my appreciation for the soundness of the excellent statements which have been made on foreign policy by the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished ranking Republican Member of the Senate, and, of course, our outstanding minority leader.

I mention this because there appears in the Washington Post this morning an editorial which bears on this whole question. It is an excellent editorial, from which I would like to quote a sentence or two, before I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD. I quote:

Public debate upon questions of foreign policy must not be diminished, curtailed, or inhibited by fears that foreign countries will misconstrue the public discussion indispensable to a democratically governed people.

There is another sentence in the editorial which I should like to quote, as follows:

It is to be hoped that no one will raise the old-fashioned admonition about politics ending at the water's edge. That was sufficient to a day when domestic issues predominated and could be separated from foreign issues.

Then I conclude with this quotation, which has to do with former Vice President Nixon's statement on foreign policy:

It may be noted, parenthetically, that the Nixon statement is hardly likely to comfort any hostile foreign power. It might be expected rather to persuade our enemies abroad that sentiment in the country is hardening and not softening. If the President chooses to take a tough and uncompromising line, he will not lack support at home—even in the opposition.

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

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

NIXON'S NEW VOICE

Nothing contributes more to making the utterances of politicians or statesmen models of clarity, force, decision, and certainty than an absence of power. The encumbrance of office, responsibility, and authority burdens the conscience, quickens apprehension, and raises doubts. It is much easier to be sure of the future when divested of the discretion to so act as to make that future.

Such are the advantages that former Vice President Richard M. Nixon now enjoys. In the first of a series of 10 articles, appearing in the Washington Post and other newspapers, Mr. Nixon makes the most of his new-found prerogatives of the man out of power. Those who have availed themselves of the same advantages while on the way to office cannot deny him his say, although they well may envy him the free-wheeling certitude with which he speaks about the great issues that confront the country.

Foreign policy is the subject of Mr. Nixon's first comment. It is to be hoped that no one will raise the old-fashioned admonition about politics ending at the water's edge. That was sufficient to a day when domestic issues predominated and could be separated from foreign issues. Public debate upon questions of foreign policy must not be diminished, curtailed, or inhibited by fears that foreign countries will misconstrue the public discussion indispensable to a democratically governed people. It may be noted, parenthetically, that the Nixon statement is hardly likely to comfort any hostile foreign power. It might be expected rather to persuade our enemies abroad that sentiment in the country is hardening and not softening. If the President chooses to take a tough and uncompromising line, he will not lack support at home—even in the opposition.

There is a clear and uncompromising aspect to Mr. Nixon's position that makes it all seem very simple. But are things quite as simple in Berlin, in Geneva, in Laos, and in Cuba? Is our only mistake in the past, or in the present, an infirmity of action—a failure to respond with force, if and when necessary?

Even where we have the force, the means of applying it do not always come quickly to hand. There are some situations that do not yield to sheer military power. There are others, of course, in which the readiness to use power if necessary may be essential to a diplomatic solution. It is to be hoped that Premier Khrushchev, for all the advantages he presently holds, will not deceive himself about that readiness in this country. We are, in a way, back where we were in the 1958 Berlin crisis. There is willingness in this country to explore any honorable and logical alternative to even the defensive use of force; but it must not be misconstrued as a readiness to yield to bluster and ultimatum. Perhaps the Nixon statement, critical of the administration as it may be, will make this fact ever more apparent abroad.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, somewhat in line with the general theme of this discussion, I would say it requires a high degree of patriotism and unselfishness for American industries to forgo profitable contracts with the Soviet Union when in their judgment accepting orders under such contracts might tend to place the Soviet Union in a position of competitive advantage which would not be in the interest of our own producers and our own economy.

Mr. M. E. Hillman, president of Republic Electric and Development Co. and Mr. Gordon B. Anderson, president of Puget Sound Fabricators, Inc., both from Seattle, Wash., merit our thanks and appreciation for thinking in terms of America and not in terms of profits and private advantage. They truly merit a salute for this action.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement published in the Seattle Daily Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Seattle Daily Times, June 1, 1961]

FIRMS HERE DECLINE RUSSIAN CONTRACT

(By Boyd Burchard)

Two Seattle firms today announced they have declined on principle a profitable proposal, approved by the State Department, which would help Russia build the largest and most highly automated sawmill in the world.

M. E. Hillman, head of Republic Electric & Development Co., and Gordon B. Anderson, president of Puget Sound Fabricators, Inc., both of Seattle, said the proposal they are declining would have led to an estimated $150,000 order—and a profit of about $40,000.

It called for supplying an advanced type of automatic lumber-sorting equipment to the Russians.

The Russian proposal came to the Seattle firms through Yarrow's, Ltd., British Columbia engineering firm.

Hillman said Republic Electric would "have no part in handing the advantage" to the Russians to "close the gap in the superiority of North American technical know-how from 20 years to 2 years."

Six of the firm's patented memory-control systems were sought.

Anderson said that Puget Sound Fabricators, Inc., will have nothing to do with "giving aid and comfort to an enemy" by supplying fabricated portions of the six lumber sorters.

"We must be willing to be counted on as thinking of our own country's welfare before the dollar," Anderson said.

Both men acknowledged that the refusal to cooperate might block the Russian mill automation only temporarily.

"Our move is a drop in the bucket," Hillman said, "but we hope that other American industry leaders will follow suit in refusing to deal with an enemy which has vowed to conquer us."

TURNDOWN OF SOVIET DEAL TOOK COURAGE

(By Boyd Burchard)

Easily one of the most inspiring business news developments of the past week originated in Seattle.

Two businessmen openly weighed the courage of their convictions and their sense of public responsibility against the dollar importance of a sure-profit deal with Russia—and told the Russians to take their dollars and go jump.

The pressures were great on M. E. Hillman, head of the Republic Electric & Development Co., and Gordon B. Anderson, president of Puget Sound Fabricators, Inc., both of Seattle, to agree to supply an advanced type of automatic lumber-sorting equipment for the largest and most highly automated sawmill in the world, to be built in Russia.

The sorter, a patented magnetic memory-control system correlated with mechanical lumber-handling equipment, was unveiled by the two companies more than a year ago.

It was shown to 1,500 Government and industry representatives from all over the world last September at the World Forestry Congress in Seattle.

The mechanical sorter was widely acclaimed as a major advance toward eliminating slow and costly manual sorting of lumber. Many large Canadian and United States mills subsequently expressed interest in installing the equipment—but the domestic lumber business turned slow and no orders have yet been firmed up by North American mills.

When the Russian order came through, in the form of a subproposal from Yarrows, Ltd., of Victoria, British Columbia, to supply $150,000 worth of sorters for a 1,500,000-board-feet-a-day sawmill to be built by the Victoria firm and the Preston Woodworking Machinery Co., Preston, Ontario, for the U.S.S.R., it took some soul searching for the American firms to refuse.

But refuse the order they did—and with no illusions as to the very minor obstruction their decision would present to the growing momentum of the Russians' economic steamroller.

In declining to cooperate, Hillman explained to Yarrow: "The one advantage we in North America have over the Communist bloc is our production know-how. To knowingly give away even the tiniest part of that production superiority represented by the excellence of the Magnestat Control System would represent to us admission of the inevitability of world domination by communism.

"REDCO will have no part in handing this advantage to our sworn enemy."

Following the Seattle firm's turndown of the proposal, a spokesman for Preston Woodworking commented in Canada: "Regardless of what was said in Seattle, we are pressing ahead on this job. We feel this export order would be most beneficial to Canadian secondary industry."

The order obviously would have been temporarily beneficial to Seattle industry, too.

The downright fortitude of the two Seattle businessmen in putting long-term national interest above short-term personal gain deserves recognition—preferably in the form of firm orders from North American sawmills faced with the growing threat of automated Russian competition.

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO., WORLD'S LARGEST MERCHANDISER, JOINS WITH FREEDOMS FOUNDATION IN AMERICAN FREEDOM CENTER GROUNDBREAKING AT VALLEY FORGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an event of considerable significance took place recently—May 1—at Valley Forge when leading officials of numerous corporations and business firms exemplifying the American free enterprise system marked the breaking of ground of the American Freedom Center.

These executives voluntarily organized themselves as the Sears' 75th Anniversary Committee both to honor Sears, Roebuck & Co., of Chicago, on its three-quarter century birthday and to raise at least $1 million as a tribute to that company for the support of activities of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

On this occasion Mr. Charles H. Kellstadt, board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co., presented to Freedoms Foundation a check for $115,000 as an initial donation from this anniversary committee. This amount and subsequent committee donations will be used toward construction of a free enterprise library and research area; to finance circulation of freedom libraries to American schools nationally; to assist in support of Valley Forge classroom teachers' medals for teachers emphasizing the free way of life; and to help finance seminars on the American way of life for large numbers of foreign students in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech made on that occasion by Mr. Kellstadt representing the world's largest merchandising organization and an outstanding example of the Nation's free enterprise system.

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

REMARKS BY MR. CHARLES H. KELLSTADT, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO., AT THE GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE AMERICAN FREEDOM CENTER OF FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE, PA., MONDAY, MAY 1, 1961

I am honored to represent Sears, Roebuck & Co. in these ceremonies today, to know that the name of Sears will be associated with the Freedom Center.

Certainly it is appropriate that the Freedom Center be erected at Valley Forge, the national shrine which has for all of us an atmosphere of personal sacrifice for national achievement. It is fitting that the Freedoms Foundation should include in the Freedom Center a library of free enterprise—for free enterprise is an essential extension of personal freedom. Freedom is indivisible.

Any act which deprives an individual of some portion of his freedom is a threat to all who enjoy these freedoms. In a sense, free enterprise as a system is suspect in the minds of many but this is a reflection of the past. Every freedom possessed by man has a history of license—man has always had to learn to live responsibly with whatever degree of freedom possessed.

The economic freedom that we possess in this country is more and more coming to be used in keeping with the national interests. All who have faith in the nature of our system welcome this ever-growing sense of responsibility because they recognize that it strengthens their own individual freedoms. Just as a free people erect a system of government based on a structure that balances out a variety of interests, so is an enterprise operating under that system concerned with balancing a variety of pressures.

There is the overall pressure for progress which can only come from the profitable operation of the business. This pressure is generated internally—within the business itself. It stems from the form of the business—the corporate form that can extend beyond the lifetime of any individual.

Every business is capable of indefinite survival so long as it has understanding and dynamic leadership. There needs to be wide understanding of the fact that profit is the outcome of every successful economic activity regardless of the political system in which that activity occurs.

The Socialist and Communist political organizations have as much need for profitable economic performance as the nations operating in a free economy.

Basic to survival is the ability of a business to serve a profitable economic function. I underline "profitable" because, in my opinion, free enterprise in this country has a vital educational job to perform on the function of profit.

The irrational indictment of the profit motive or profits as an economic fact must be applied to all systems because all systems must produce a profit if a nation is to survive. A free enterprise economy is characterized by a higher degree of private control of economic resources—and the profits that result from their use.

If these resources are used unskillfully, the individual bears the penalty of the failure. If the resources are used skillfully, the individual bears the responsibility for the wise use of the profit produced. Not only must profit be used responsibly, it must be generated in a responsible fashion.

In a free enterprise system, the operation of every business calls for a constant balancing of responsibility to our customers, shareowners, sources of supply, employees, and the public at large. The responsibility of the shareowners brings the function of profit more sharply into focus in the free enterprise system.

Management at any one time must have a sense of history—an awareness of the past and present because of the effect on the future.

The span of management activity in any one company at any one time will, in the long run, represent only a fraction of that company's life.

There must be close attention to the future effects of managements' acts—and nowhere is this better illustrated than in the decisions that must be made on the use of the profit generated by the business. As a single illustration, consider the matter of the reinvestment of earnings. Policies of reinvestment are important to this country's national interests, both at home and abroad.

Reinvestment is vital to our national growth—it produces the percentages with which this growth is measured. Reinvestment can be translated into a personal meaning for our people because it converts the abstract term of opportunity into the reality of jobs.

One area in which business has claimed leadership and taken initiative is in this matter of giving substance to the dream of opportunity—the chance to get a job and to progress in keeping with ability. Reinvestment is a commitment to the future—an act of faith. And reinvestment overseas is equally significant to our national interests. We must face up to the fact that the United States must fast become a trading nation and the business community has a responsibility to prove itself in the markets of the world.

This proof, of course, must be a dollars and cents proof—but over and above that, it must be measured by the standards of free enterprise at its most constructive best. We must prove abroad what we have come to prove in this country—that free enterprise willingly accepts its responsibility of using the inherent strength in service for the common good. I believe I can say from Sears' experience with successful oversea operation that the decision to invest abroad must carry with it a decision to reinvest abroad.

Free enterprise at its best accepts a responsibility for those who are employed in the business. This responsibility takes many forms, starting with the initial one of proper selection and placement of those employed. This is essential to the full development of the individual's abilities and his use of them in the enterprise. There is a responsibility for fair wages. There is a responsibility for providing proper benefit plans which aid the individual to protect himself and his family against the contingencies of life. There is a responsibility to provide a type of organization which permits people to work together in a way that allows them to make full use of their skills—to create a working environment that permits people to progress in keeping with the contribution they make to the success of the business.

The ability of Sears—or any company—to sell its wares—and prosper—to provide continuous employment—to earn a return on the shareowner's investment, depends on the dedication of the organization and the climate of public opinion in which it must operate. It must constantly earn and deserve public respect and good will. A company's most precious asset and the most fragile is its reputation. It can be preserved only by constant exposure, increased or diminished in size and importance by how it is won.

Next most precious asset of any company is its people. Some would have you believe that conflict between management and employees is inescapable; that should not be so. The interests of each are the same. Together they form the power of the effort. The company is also an asset of the employee—individually and collectively. Its success is his success. During his productive life it represents an equity holding, an estate to care for him beyond the productive years—and his family beyond even that.

In the free enterprise system we must also take into account the relationship of the enterprise with the public. There is a responsibility to strengthen the system through accounting for stewardship. Public understanding of the economic role of business is the best guarantee of a continuing freedom our economic system requires.

Wise management reinvests in public understanding through skillful communication and the support of community efforts which are worthy of and require a portion of the profits generated by the business community.

No business is completely self-sufficient, it must rely to one extent or another upon the goods and services provided by others.

There is an obligation to respect the economic role of sources of supply, to recognize that in the long run the success of these interacting businesses are bound together inseparably. The ability to discharge all of these responsibilities depends in the final analysis upon the ability to serve the customer; and this, too, must be done responsibly in a free enterprise system.

It is the freedom of the customer to buy; how, when, and where, he and he alone desires, that is the central crucial fact in a free enterprise system. It is the customer's freedom to choose; business' freedom to compete, that makes a free market—one means nothing without the other. An enterprise which does not respect the customer's freedom has no claim for respect of its own freedom. The success stories of American enterprise are the stories of businesses which have met these responsibilities.

I hope that in the years to come the accumulated records of these businesses will find a home in this Freedom Center library, that those who use this library will find in those records cause for dedication to the free enterprise system—that these records will make it plain that free enterprise is an expression of personal freedom. This library must be more than simply a repository for past records; its purpose should not be to commemorate the past, but to serve the future. This is the attitude that prevails at Sears during our 75th anniversary year.

We are proud of what has been accomplished in the past, but we recognize that is merely a prolog, a prolog to a future that is bright with promise for service in the free enterprise tradition.

I must express the gratitude of Sears, Roebuck & Co. to our many friends who have made this building possible. I am pleased that Sears' conduct of its business over the years has warranted the tribute they have seen fit to pay. If Sears were unique as a development of a free enterprise system, we would not be here today.

I hope that all of us can be more confident of the future through a realization that Sears, Roebuck & Co. is not unique, but typical of what can be accomplished in a free enterprise economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

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. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROPOSED CHANGES IN REVENUE CODE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss two of the administration's proposals as they relate to changes in our revenue code. First, the administration would liberalize the present method of computing depreciation on property, and second, it proposes to repeal the present 4-percent tax credit on dividends.

The administration is recommending these two changes presumably on the assumption that their enactment would encourage investment capital, thereby promoting an expanded economy, but the administration overlooks the fact that these two proposals are contradictory.

The repeal of the present 4-percent dividend tax credit—which was approved in 1954—would mean a $400 million increase in taxes for the investors of America. Certainly this $400 million tax increase on the stockholders of American industry would diminish their ability to reinvest in an expanded economy.

Another important argument in favor of the 4-percent dividend credit is that Congress at the time it enacted the provision recognized that some adjustment was due in order to minimize the effect of the double taxation on corporate income. Under existing law the corporations already pay a 52-percent tax on their earned income, and the dividends which are distributed by the corporations are a part of the remaining 48 percent. Under existing law these dividends are fully taxable again to the stockholders except as the 1954 legislation provided for an exemption of the first $50 in dividends received plus a 4-percent tax credit on those dividends in excess of $50.

To repeal this tax credit at this time would be a step backwards and would seriously lessen the inducement or the ability of the investors to furnish the capital necessary for the expansion of our economy.

When the administration recommended this backward step, it failed to take into consideration that it would be a direct contradiction of its second recommendation, which was to liberalize the depreciation rates and thereby encourage the necessary capital to finance the growth of our economy.

I favor the liberalization of our present outmoded depreciation schedules. In a period of rapid obsolescence of machinery and factories it is essential that we have a more realistic depreciation basis, but I do not think that the method of approach as recommended by the administration is sound and fair.

The administration's formula of allowing as a tax credit a percentage of the new investment is so complicated that the average taxpayer who cannot afford a tax attorney would never understand it and thereby would lose most of its benefits.

It gives little or no relief whatever to the farmer or to the small businessman, nor does it help the large business operation which is going through a period of low earnings or a period wherein the industry is already overexpanded.

For example, of what benefit would the administration's formula for computing more liberal depreciation allowances on new construction be to the American railroads? The benefits under the administration's bill will be of use only to industries which are expanding their existing capacities or facilities, and certainly we have enough railroads.

The administration's formula for depreciation would provide substantial benefits or tax reductions for those industries or taxpayers who are more prosperous and who are connected with an expanding industry.

The administration's formula of giving a tax credit for a percentage of the cost of new construction is in effect a favored tax reduction for a certain group. The tax credit would not be charged against the depreciable value of the property.

I repeat: It is my opinion that we need a more realistic approach in our depreciation allowances for American industry; but the formula should be one which will give comparable benefits to all segments of American economy, and the formula should be one which is readily understandable by all taxpayers, large or small.

Instead of the administration's complicated formula for tax credits, I would suggest that we use the formula for depreciation in existing tax laws as a base. It would be a very simple matter to amend that section of existing law allowing for accelerated rates of depreciation under what is defined as the declining balance method.

For example, under existing law a taxpayer building a factory with a 20-year life or a farmer building a barn with a 20-year life can choose between taking a straight line depreciation of 5 percent annually or he can elect to use the accelerated rate method under which he would double the rate of depreciation in each of the years on a declining balance method.

For instance, suppose the barn cost $10,000. Instead of depreciating the barn at 5 percent annually the taxpayer can take double the rate or 10 percent the first year, thereby reducing his investment to $9,000 in the first year. In the subsequent years he can do the same; for instance, the second year his depreciation would be 10 percent of the remaining $9,000, or $900, thus reducing his investment to $8,100, and so on.

Instead of the administration's recommending an additional formula which is so complicated that few can understand it, my suggestion would be merely to amend the present law and to allow the taxpayers to treble, instead of double, their depreciation rates in each of the years on the same declining balance formula. Under this simple liberalization of a formula already in our existing law, the benefits to the taxpayers would be practically the same as under the administration's plan, but there would be the advantage of having a formula which everybody can understand.

Mr. President, I cite examples of how this further acceleration of the present declining balance method would work, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Example:

Building cost, $100,000—Life, 25 years

Present law Declining balance method of doubling rate—2×4 percent=8 percent		Suggested change to treble rate on declining balance method—3×4 percent=12 percent	
1st year:		1st year:	
Cost	$100,000.00	Cost	$100,000.00
Depreciation, 8 percent	8,000.00	Depreciation, 12 percent	12,000.00
Balance	92,000.00	Balance	88,000.00
2d year: Depreciation, 8 percent of $92,000	7,360.00	2d year: Depreciation, 12 percent of $88,000	10,560.00
Balance	84,640.00	Balance	77,440.00
3d year: Depreciation, 8 percent of $84,640	6,771.20	3d year: Depreciation, 12 percent of $77,440	9,292.80
Balance	77,868.80	Balance	68,147.20
Etc.		Etc.	

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if this formula is not liberal enough, the rate could be accelerated further by using quadruple the basic rate.

In order that this simple formula may be compared with the complicated one recommended by the administration, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD an analysis of their formula, along with specific examples of how it would work.

One point which must not be overlooked is that the administration's formula is more of a tax reduction than a liberalization of depreciation schedules. If a tax reduction is the objective, that could be accomplished by a simple lowering of existing tax rates.

This analysis of the administration's formula was prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

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

MEMORANDUM, JUNE 12, 1961

Subject: Credit for investment in certain depreciable property.

The President's tax message recommended the adoption of a tax credit available to taxpayers under the conditions described.

1. The credit is computed on the basis of the investment made in new plant and equipment put into use for the first time by the taxpayer.

2. The amount of the credit is determined by reference to the current depreciation allowance of the taxpayer for the first year in which the taxpayer can depreciate the property. The credit is the sum of: (a) 15 percent of all new plant and equipment investment expenditures in excess of current depreciation allowances, plus (b) 6 percent of such expenditures in excess of 50 percent of depreciation allowances and not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation allowances.

In the alternative, a minimum credit is provided of 10 percent on the first $5,000 of new investment for the benefit of small taxpayers.

3. The credit is used as an offset against the taxpayer's income tax liability up to 30 percent of that liability in the year in which it arises. The amount of any credit not used can be carried over against future taxes for 5 years. Of course, the 30-percent limitation continues to apply to all current or carryover credits.

4. The credit applies to industrial, commercial, and agricultural property and to personal property and to buildings. However, real estate and personal property used in connection with furnishing lodging (apartment houses, motels, hotels, private houses) does not qualify, and expenditures by public utilities in connection with the public utility business (other than transportation) do not qualify for the credit.

5. To prevent manipulation, provision is made that a deficiency in expenditures from a prior year must be made up before a credit is applicable. These deficiencies will be carried over for 5 years, but, of course, there is no deficiency as to any taxpayer for the first taxable year to part of which the statute is applicable.

6. Lessees using eligible property for 6 or more years will be given the credit and not the lessors.

7. Recapture provisions are provided under which the tax credit is "recaptured" if the property with respect to which a credit has been given is disposed of or ceases to be used in the appropriate manner within 6 years.

EXAMPLES

Example 1: Taxpayer A, in its first taxable year to which the credit is applicable, has a depreciation deduction for the year of $110,000 and invests and begins to use new plant and equipment of appropriate kind which cost it $150,000. Its credit is computed as follows:

Computation of 15 percent credit:	
New investment	$150,000
Minus depreciation deduction for year	110,000
Basis for computation of 15 percent credit	40,000
15 percent credit on $40,000	6,000
Computation of 6 percent credit:	
New investment not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation deduction	110,000
Minus 5 percent of depreciation deduction	55,000
Basis for computation of 6 percent credit	55,000
6 percent credit on $55,000	3,300
Total credit	9,300

If taxpayer A, has an income tax liability for the year of $31,000 or more, the full $9,300 credit can be used in the year of acquisition (this is because 30 percent of $31,000 equals $9,300). On the other hand, if the income tax liability before the credit is less than $31,000, the 30-percent limitation applies. So, if the tax before the credit were $25,000, the limitation for the year would be $7,500 ($25,000 times 30 percent); $7,500 of the credit could then be used during the year and the remaining $1,800

($9,300 minus $7,500) would be carried over to later years.

Example 2: Taxpayer B, during its first taxable year to which the credit is applicable, has a depreciation deduction of $110,000 and invests and begins to use new plant and equipment which cost it $75,000. Its credit is computed as follows:

Computation of 15 percent credit:	
New investment	$75,000
Minus depreciation deduction for year	110,000
Basis for computation of 15 percent credit	None
15 percent credit on none	None
Computation of 6 percent credit:	
New investment not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation deduction	75,000
Minus 50 percent of depreciation deduction	55,000
Basis for computation of 6 percent credit	20,000
6 percent credit on $20,000	1,200
Total credit	1,200

The $1,200 would be fully available against the income tax liability for the current year if such liability were $4,000 or more (because $4,000 times 30 percent equals $1,200). If the tax liability for the current year were only $3,000, only $900 (30 percent times $3,000) could be used up against such liability, and the remaining $300 would be carried over to later years.

Example 3 (minimum credit): Taxpayer C, during the first year to which the credit is applicable, has a depreciation deduction of $5,000 and invests in and begins to use new plant and equipment which cost it $7,000. The credit is computed as follows:

Computation of 15 percent credit:	
New investment	$7,000
Minus depreciation deduction for year	5,000
Basis for computation of 15 percent credit	2,000
15 percent credit on $2,000	300
Computation of 6 percent credit:	
New investment not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation deduction	5,000
Minus 50 percent of depreciation deduction	2,500
Basis for computation of 6 percent credit	2,500
6 percent credit on $2,500	150
Total tentative credit on above computation	450

However, in this case it is necessary also to make the computation for the minimum credit which is as follows:

Minimum credit of 10 percent on first $5,000 expenditures	$500

Since the minimum credit is greater than the credit as otherwise computed, the minimum credit is applicable and the taxpayer's credit for the year is $500.

Example 4: Taxpayer D, for its first taxable year to which the credit applies (the credit applying to the full 12-month year) has a depreciation deduction of $100,000 and invests in and begins to use new plant and equipment which cost $45,000. Thus, its 15 percent credit and its 6 percent credit are both zero. However, as illustrated by example 3 above, it is entitled to a credit of 10 percent on the first $5,000 of new investment or $500. Its credit for the year is, thus, $500. In addition, however, it has deficiencies in expenditures computed as follows:

Computation of 15 percent credit (deficiency):	
New investment	$45,000
Minus depreciation deduction for year	100,000
Deficiency for purposes of 15 percent credit	55,000
Computation of 6 percent credit (deficiency):	
New investment not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation deduction for year	45,000
Minus 50 percent of depreciation deduction for year	50,000
Deficiency for purposes of 6 percent credit	5,000

Accordingly, in the next year taxpayer D is only entitled to a 15 percent credit on the amount by which its new investment exceeds its depreciation deduction, plus $55,000, and only entitled to a 6 percent credit on the amount by which its new investment is less than 100 percent of the depreciation deduction and exceeds $5,000 plus one-half the depreciation deduction. Thus, if in the immediately succeeding year the depreciation deduction is $100,000, and the taxpayer acquires and begins to use new plant and equipment which cost it $160,000, the computations are as follows:

Computation of 15 percent credit:	
New investment	$160,000
Minus sum of: (a) depreciation deduction for year, $100,000 and (b) deficiency carryover, $55,000	155,000
Basis for computation of 15 percent credit	5,000
15 percent credit on $5,000	750
Computation of 6 percent credit:	
New investment not in excess of 100 percent of depreciation deduction	100,000
Minus sum of (a) 50 percent of depreciation deduction, $50,000, and (b) deficiency carryover, $5,000	55,000
Basis for computation of 6 percent credit	45,000
6 percent credit on $45,000	2,700
Total credit for year	3,450

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for coming forward with a depreciation program that is so simple that the people of the United States can understand it.

I am receiving a large quantity of mail from industrial and business leaders all over the Nation, who state frankly that they do not understand or approve of the administration's proposals in this field. So if the Senator from Delaware has arrived at a simple answer to this problem, it will be received with favor by industry generally, and will be helpful, I believe, to our committee which in a short time will wrestle with this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

I have checked on this matter with the committee staff, and they have assured me that the formula I propose will work, and it is simple.

Under present law, the taxpayer is allowed to double the depreciation rate in each of the years on a declining-balance method. This formula is applicable to the United States Steel Corp. building a new steel plant or to a farmer building a new barn. It would be a simple matter to amend the law tripling instead of doubling, the depreciation rate each year on the same declining-balance method.

Under present law, for example, in the case of a new $10,000 barn, assuming a 20-year life, the farmer could, by doubling the rate, take 10 percent depreciation the first year, thereby reducing his investment to $9,000; and the next year he could take an additional 10 percent of the remaining $9,000, or $900, thus reducing his investment to $8,100; and so forth.

The method I propose as a simple formula for further liberalization of the depreciation schedule would work as follows:

In the first year, this farmer would take depreciation at three times the normal rate, or 15 percent, which would amount to depreciation of $1,500 the first year and would leave him with a net investment of $8,500—assuming that the barn cost $10,000, and had a 20-year life. The second year he could take another 15 percent depreciation of the balance; in that case it would be 15 percent of the remaining $8,500—and so on in succeeding years.

This formula is one which any Kansas farmer who is building a corncrib or a manufacturer who is building a steel plant in Pennsylvania can understand without employing a lot of Washington lawyers to explain the formula or to obtain permits for them.

In contrast, the joint committee staff has prepared an analysis of the administration formula, and it has taken the joint committee five pages to analyze the administration's formula. I have inserted that analysis in the RECORD to show just how complicated it is.

The staff did an excellent job in preparing an analysis of the administration's formula; but I do not understand the administration's formula, and I do not think any other Member of Congress understands it. I can readily understand how it is that members of industry say they cannot understand it. I am opposed to placing on the statute books any tax law so complicated that the Treasury Department itself scarcely understands it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. After listening to the distinguished Senator from Delaware explain his proposal, I believe I understand it. However, it seems to me that his proposal is so simple that perhaps it would not be too well received by some, because of the very fact that some persons seem to feel that the tax laws must be complicated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am afraid my proposal is subject to that objection. As the Senator from Kansas remembers, when the declining-balance method was first placed into the law it

was objected to by many of the so-called tax experts who came before the committee. Frankly, the only conclusion I reached from their testimony was that the formula was so simple that it would put them out of their jobs of interpreting the tax law. I think that is the only objection that can be found to this proposal which I am advancing to liberalize our present depreciation rates.

I believe we should liberalize the depreciation rates because plants and equipment become obsolete very quickly. But in liberalizing the present rates, I believe we should have a formula which will be readily understandable and which will be fair to all taxpayers, regardless of whether they are engaged in industry or are engaged in farming.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATIONS FOR NEW FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, following approval of the omnibus judgeship bill, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I wrote to all the bar associations in New York State, and asked them to recommend the best qualified attorneys for the newly created vacancies. We specifically suggested that such recommendations be made "without regard to the political affiliation of the prospective candidates, and solely on the basis of their qualifications to serve as Federal judges."

As a result of our request, over 60 candidates were proposed by the bar associations. The names and material in support of all these candidates were transmitted to the Attorney General. Several of the bar associations advised us that they would make no recommendations, because their members did not practice before any of the courts involved. The courts involved are the Southern District Court of New York, the Eastern District Court of New York, and also the court of appeals. By their responses, they meant, I am sure, that their members do not practice before the southern district court or the eastern district court.

Several others indicated they would not recommend candidates, but would like an opportunity to consider the qualifications of any nominees proposed. At least one bar association, the Queens County Bar Association, is still continuing its review of possible candidates, and is expected to make recommendations thereafter.

We received replies from virtually every bar association, and they were overwhelmingly favorable to our request for candidates. The Attorney General also expressed his appreciation for our efforts, and gave us his written assurance that the recommendations of the bar associations "will be given the most careful consideration when the selection of the additional judges as provided for by S. 912 is made." Our efforts were also commended by the chairman of the American Bar Associations' Committee on Federal Judiciary, Bernard G. Segal, whose selfless nonpartisan efforts in this field extend over many years, and who is personally known to many of the Members of this body.

Frankly, Mr. President, I would have been surprised if such approval of our efforts had not been forthcoming. It seems obvious to me that the bar associations of any area are in the best possible position to canvass the legal talent available and to propose, on the basis of objective criteria, the names of the lawyers most qualified for appointment to the judiciary.

We emphasized throughout our interest in nonpartisan designations. We have transmitted the names to the Attorney General without regard to personal preference. In fact one of the lawyers whose name we transmitted was the chairman of his county Democratic committee and I am sure that in his position he worked against the election of both New York Senators. I learned of this candidate's position because he was thoughtful enough to write to us after he learned that we had transmitted his name to the Attorney General, to advise us of his position in order to avoid, as he put it:

> Even the slightest embarrassment to the distinguished Senators from this State.

In our reply to this distinguished lawyer we stated:

> We made no inquiry respecting the politics of any of the candidates recommended by the bar associations in New York in transmitting the names of the candidates to the Department of Justice and we intend to continue our efforts in this regard in the same spirit.

Of course, some of the candidates recommended did not have to tell us about their political affiliation. They were well-known Democrats. At least two of them were Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. We were, of course, delighted at the recognition these Members received from their bar associations and if anything considered it a special privilege to be able to bring their high standing in the law to the attention of the Attorney General.

With this background, Mr. President, you will understand the utter disbelief with which I read in one of our reliable New York newspapers that we had been bitterly attacked by another Democratic Member of the House of Representatives—the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee—for our conduct. He was quoted as having described our effort to obtain recommendations as "the brashest thing I ever heard of." According to this same story he went on to accuse us of the "most untoward, unseemly conduct."

In checking this story, I found—unfortunately—that these quotations were accurate and not typographical errors, as I had hoped.

(At this point Senator KEATING yielded to other Senators for consideration of other matters, which appear elsewhere under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it occurred to me that perhaps the gentleman was not fully apprised of our correspondence, but I am informed that he is familiar with every detail of our efforts including the fact that we passed on the recommendations of two of his colleagues. I thought then that perhaps the gentleman's ire was aroused because he had not been recommended by any of the bar associations including that of Kings County, from which he comes—but I have been informed that he is not interested in Federal judicial office or in retiring from his present seat of power. I have exhausted every possible explanation for his bitter remarks, but none seem satisfactory to me even after the most thorough reconsideration of our actions.

Some explanations I rejected immediately. I cannot believe, for example, that anyone at this date in our history would be so callous as to suggest that lifetime appointments to the Federal judiciary should be dispensed as political plums without consultation with any bar associations.

That has not been the case for at least 8 years; perhaps longer. Not a single person was appointed to the Federal bench during the entire period of the Eisenhower administration who was not first found qualified by the American Bar Association after a full investigation. I cannot believe that this practice will be discontinued by President Kennedy, and in fact I know that assurances already have been given to the contrary.

What we have proposed admittedly goes one step beyond this practice. But there are reasons for taking this additional step which I believe every reasonable person would find compelling.

As Mr. Segal pointed out in a recent address on this subject, this year may well be regarded in the future as the start of a new era in the history of the Federal judiciary. He gives three basic reasons for this prophecy:

First, for the first time in 40 years, the judges sitting in the Federal courts throughout the Nation are just about evenly divided as to their preappointment political party affiliation.

Second, as a result of vacancies, impending retirements and the enactment of legislation creating 73 new Federal judges, President Kennedy will be called upon to nominate at least 125 judges during his first year in office—more judges than any other President has appointed during his entire term in office.

Third, to quote Mr. Segal again:

> The campaign of the organized bar for appointment of only the most qualified lawyers and judges to the Federal bench, without regard to political party, now has the widest public acceptance it has ever received.

I have no reason to believe that either President Kennedy or his Attorney General are insensitive to these factors. Indeed, while it is too early to draw any conclusions, both the President and the Attorney General have given repeated assurances that only the best qualified individuals will be appointed to our Federal courts. And as I have already indicated, the Attorney General received the recommendations of the bar associations gratefully and with interest.

Moreover, the President last year, while he was still serving in the Senate, wrote a very significant letter to the president of the American Bar Associ-

ation, in which he pledged his full cooperation in the efforts of the association to promote the nonpartisan appointment of judges. Senator Kennedy stated in his letter:

I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office.

Let me recollect also for those who have forgotten, that Attorney General Rogers likewise pledged that under the conditions that now prevail, judges would be nominated on a wholly bipartisan basis. Vice President Nixon joined in this pledge and explicitly stated in a letter to the president of the American Bar Association:

I believe it is essential that the best qualified lawyers and judges available be appointed to judicial office, and that the number of judges in Federal courts from each of the major political parties be approximately equal.

Much of the same sentiment is reflected in the Republican Party platform adopted last year which contained a plank recommended by the American Bar Association calling for Federal judges to be "appointed on the basis of highest qualifications and without limitation to a single political party."

I know from conversations I had with Attorney General Rogers last year, when I was doing my best to obtain enactment of judgeship legislation recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, that he and President Eisenhower—and, if he had been elected, Vice President Nixon—would have carried out this principle to the letter. I am not, therefore, suggesting to the present administration a course of action I did not fully endorse during the last administration. I have been entirely consistent throughout and I intend to continue my efforts regardless of who the nominating power may be, to prevent forevermore a return to the spoils system which prevailed under both parties in the past and which resulted in as much as 98 percent of all judges being appointed from the same political party during some administrations.

We are talking now about 125 judges, almost one-third of the total number of judges serving in the Federal courts. To pick these appointments out of a patronage grab bag would be a gross disrespect for the integrity and independence of the Federal judiciary. To suggest such a course reveals contempt for the public interest. I do not believe that our President, who came into office with the promise that he would lead the American people across new frontiers, would cooperate in any such process. To keep faith with the American people, he must firmly reject this advice, no matter how ancient its source, or powerful the pressures behind it.

No nominations have been made to date for any of the newly created judgeships. There have been cynical explanations for this delay which usually involve the word "leverage." I prefer to believe that the delay indicates the President is fully aware of the importance of the task facing him and that he intends to proceed carefully in his search for those best qualified to serve our Nation as judges. I hope that we have been of some assistance to the President in contacting our State's bar associations for suggestions and that he does not consider our conduct in any way brash or unseemly. Indeed, I would go so far as to hope that the President would invite, or at least welcome, similar efforts on the part of bar associations throughout the Nation to determine who are the most eminent members of the legal profession available for service on the bench.

There is a great reservoir of legal talent in this country. If it is tapped properly, it can add new luster and respect to our courts. Justice is the hallmark of freedom. The quality of justice is really what I have been talking about. Let no one taint this sacred concept with the nonsensical notions that filter out of smoke-filled back rooms. In this vital area we must not yield to considerations that would make political interest rather than national interest the prime test of fitness for judicial office.

Mr. President, recently a brief with regard to judicial appointments was submitted to the President of the United States by the American Bar Association through its special committee on nonpartisan selection of the Federal judiciary. This brief urges the President to follow a policy which would completely remove judicial appointments from the area of political patronage, proposes the creation of an independent commission as an agency of the President to advise with the President on appointments, stresses that nominations should rest solely in the President of the United States, and calls for recognition of a general principle that a substantial percentage of the members of any Federal court should be from the ranks of the party other than that of the President who is to make the appointment.

I have found this brief very persuasive and I hope that it will receive the attention and agreement of the President. It contains advice for the Members of Congress as well as the Chief Executive, and because of its general importance to the whole problem of judicial appointments, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the American Bar Association's brief be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY:

In your letter of August 30, 1960, while you were a Member of the U.S. Senate, addressed to John D. Randall, then president of the American Bar Association, you expressed your approval of the concept of a "qualified and independent judiciary" and stated you "hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office."

The American Bar Association believes that the best qualified persons available should be appointed as Federal judges and that political affiliation should be considered only to the extent it may be necessary so to do in order to maintain a fair balance on the Federal bench between the two major political parties.

In Los Angeles on August 26, 1958, after most extended study[1] and debate,[2] the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, its policymaking body, by an overwhelming vote set forth a statement of fundamental principles which should underlie selection to the Federal judiciary and made certain specific recommendations.

Mr. President, you have now the opportunity to set a splendid precedent for succeeding Presidents.[3] The Federal courts are now in balance for the first time in at least 100 years. A rough equality between the two great political parties should be maintained, and in the future political affiliation should be regarded as secondary and the effort should be to secure the best qualified person available irrespective of his political affiliation.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt first assumed office there was a gross imbalance as to the Federal courts—for approximately 72 percent of the then sitting Federal judges were Republicans as of the dates of their appointments.[4] Yet you may not know that President Eisenhower when he assumed office on January 20, 1953,[5] faced an even greater imbalance than did President Franklin D. Roosevelt.[6]

It is true that the great majority of our Federal judges have been persons of high integrity, diligently seeking to administer justice fairly and impartially. Such is the genius of our country that men and women do rise above themselves when placed in positions of power and responsibility.

Nevertheless when political affiliation is an important factor in the appointments to the Federal judiciary, State judges, because of their withdrawal from political activities during their judicial tenure, with rare exceptions are not considered for Federal judicial appointments.

---

[1] Since August 1957, when the resolution was first introduced.

[2] See Journal, American Bar Association, November 1958, pp. 1109–1112.

[3] When Cleveland became President in 1884 the Federal judiciary was better than 95 percent Republican. Not a single Democrat had been named to the Supreme Court since 1861. The percentages of partisan appointments by each President beginning with Cleveland to November 4, 1955, are as follows: Cleveland, 97.3 percent Democratic; Harrison (when he took office more than a majority of the Federal bench was Republican), 87.9 percent Republican; McKinley, 95.7 percent Republican; Theodore Roosevelt, 95.8 percent Republican; Taft (when he took office the Federal bench was already predominantly Republican), 82.2 percent Republican; Wilson, 98.7 percent Democratic; Harding (when he took office the Federal bench was approximately equally divided between the parties), 97.7 percent Republican; Coolidge, 94.1 percent Republican; Hoover (when he took office the Federal bench was already predominantly Republican), 85.7 percent Republican; F. D. Roosevelt (during his term the Federal bench was for the first time predominantly Democratic), 97 percent Democratic; Truman (when he took office the Federal bench was still more predominantly Democratic), 92.2 percent Democratic. Reports of American Bar Association, 1956, vol. 81, p. 439; see also "Political Influences in the Selection of Federal Judges," Judge Evan A. Evans, C.C.A. (now deceased), Wisconsin Law Review, 1948; and "The Federal Judges as Political Patronage," Chief Judge J. Earl Major, C.C.A. (now deceased), Chicago Bar Record, October 1956, vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 7 et seq.

[4] 172 Republicans; 57 Democrats; for a percentage of 72 percent. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 1, p. 626.

[5] 80 percent.

[6] Reports of the American Bar Association, 1956, vol. 81, at p. 438.

Moreover in any period there will be a substantial number of our States in which highly qualified persons are precluded from consideration for appointment to the Federal judiciary because of the accident that during their particular fruitful years their own party may have been out of power in the presidency.

More serious, however, is the threat to the foundation upon which our Federal courts must rest. As was said by the Federal Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association in its report of February 1956:

"In this critical period when the attention of the public is focused on the judiciary perhaps more keenly than ever before, it is important that our people do not come to believe judicial decisions are partisan pronouncements or pronouncements by partisan judges.

"We know that when the American lawyer becomes a judge he can and almost invariably does throw off all partisan ties and prejudices. But the lay public does not understand this unique trait of the lawyer.

"This committee and its predecessors, therefore, have deplored the selection of Federal judges on a partisan basis, not only almost entirely from the political party then in power but often from those who had been most active on behalf of that party. We fear the loss of the great public confidence our courts must always have."

From your own experience we know the danger it would be to our security if those who are to lead us in the Armed Forces, in the major capitals of the world and at the conference tables, had been first chosen for partisan or patronage considerations rather than on merit alone and from the best qualified for the position. Almost as dangerous would be a selection practice that tended to cause the American people to believe that a partisan or patronage consideration, rather than merit, was the controlling factor.

We are not unmindful, Mr. President, of your earnest desire to select the best persons available for appointment to the Federal judiciary, and we are appreciative of the fine cooperation you and the office of the Attorney General intend to give to the American Bar Association's Committee on the Federal Judiciary, and to avail yourself of its services. Yet the selection of judges of our Federal courts, guardians of our people's lives, liberty and property (certainly internally and in time of peace), has been for many years under a system which does not necessarily result in the selection from the best qualified for the position irrespective of party affiliation and activity.

We recognize that Senators of the same political party as the President exert heavy pressure for the appointment of persons to the Federal judiciary who are affiliated with their political party, all too often on a patronage level and rendering it difficult for the President to select the best person available for judicial appointment notwithstanding his sincere desire so to do.

We believe that the time is most propitious for you to adopt a plan for judicial selection that will assure appointments to the Federal judiciary only of those best qualified, on merit and irrespective of party affiliation.

In the words of the resolution of the American Bar Association:

"The nominations of all persons to serve as members of the Federal judiciary should rest solely in the President of the United States; and the U.S. Senators in a spirit of unselfish public service should restrict themselves to their constitutional duty of conducting thorough investigations, and expressing their considered judgment on the qualifications of the nominees."

The great constitutional principle and the inherent dangers involved were pictured by Hamilton in The Federalists when he said.[7]

"A third objection to the Senate as a court of impeachments, is drawn from the agency they are to have in the appointments to office. It is imagined that they would be too indulgent judges of the conduct of men, in whose official creation they had participated.

"It will be the office of the President to nominate, and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint. There will of course be no exertion of choice on the part of the Senate. They may defeat one choice of the executive, and oblige him to make another; but they cannot themselves choose—they can only ratify or reject the choice he may have made. They might even entertain a preference to some other person, at the very moment they were assenting to the one proposed; because there might be no positive ground of opposition to him; and they could not be sure, if they withheld their assent, that the subsequent nomination would fall upon their own favorite, or upon any other person in their estimation more meritorious than the one rejected. Thus it could hardly happen, that the majority of the Senate would feel any other complacency toward the object of an appointment, than such as the appearances of merit might inspire, and proofs of the want of it destroyed."

Mr. President, it is next our duty to call to your attention that portion of the resolution of the American Bar Association of August 26, 1958,[8] urging that: "Suggestions for nominations should originate in an independent commission established as an agency of the President, to advise with the President on appointments, and to receive from outside sources and from all segments of the organized bar, suggestions of names of persons deemed highly qualified for appointment as judges in their respective jurisdictions."

When this resolution had been first introduced, such a highly respected publication as the Journal of the American Judicature Society editorially stated:[9]

"A resolution calling for the creation of an independent commission to aid the President in screening candidates for Federal judgeships and take the selection of Federal judges out of the area of political patronage was presented to the Assembly of the American Bar Association last month and by it referred to the association's Committees on Federal Judiciary and on Judicial Selection, Tenure, and Compensation. We cherish the hope that something good may come of that, but of course it will take time."

After its adoption the Journal of the American Judicature Society had this to say:[10]

"Since 1937 the American Bar Association has been on record in favor of a nonpartisan State judiciary selected by executive appointment with the assistance of an independent nominating commission. In this resolution the association for the first time takes formal cognizance of the like need in the Federal judiciary and commits itself to a continuing effort to procure it.

"Predicting widespread support for this action of the American Bar Association, the Washington Post and Times Herald observe that 'perhaps the best safeguard is a vigilant bar and public sounding frequent demands for judicial-minded men of the law instead of political office seekers on the bench.'"

Such a commission chosen by the President and to serve during his pleasure would be constituted of persons of the highest personal integrity, character, and objectivity; and capable of judging the qualifications of persons for a judicial appointment. This should assure that political considerations would not predominate in their recommendations with respect to persons to be considered for judicial office. It is not contemplated by one committee that the commission would be a statutory one.

The only function and responsibility of the commission would be to screen and obtain suggestions from any source and advise the President of its recommendations.

The sole criterion for the guidance of the commission would be for judges to be chosen on a non-political basis, solely on merit and "be as far removed as possible from the vicissitudes, contentions, hostilities, and prejudices of party politics,"[11] and be only those who possess the highest qualifications. We do not intend to imply that persons who have engaged in political activities or have held political office should be precluded from appointments to judicial positions, but political affiliations should be a secondary consideration, and high qualifications for judicial service should be the test. It is submitted that such a commission so constituted and so instructed, could not help but afford a President invaluable assistance in the performance of his constitutional duty in the selection of judges.

It is also believed that a commission functioning in the manner above stated, would be able, whenever a vacancy occurred or a new judgeship was to be created, to act promptly in obtaining information as to the most qualified persons to be considered for appointment and to screen the qualifications of those suggested to it from any sources—reporting its findings to the President.

More and more the Federal courts have come to concern all of our citizens and to affect the lives, liberties, and properties of countless millions aside from the actual litigants. It is not enough that the judges be completely impartial and nonpartisan—they must be so believed and accepted by the lawyers of America, the litigants, and the American people. The entire selection process, therefore, must be such as to insulate the Federal judges against even a suspicion that they are not or cannot be, impartial or nonpartisan. Even as Caesar's wife, they must be above suspicion.

It is contemplated that the President will have the assistance of the Department of Justice in investigating the qualifications and fitness of persons under consideration for judicial appointment and reporting to the President its findings and its recommendations with respect thereto.

It is also recognized, of course, that the functions of the commission will be advisory and the final selection of persons to be nominated for judicial office, is and should be, the constitutional responsibility and prerogative of the President.

To conclude and summarize, Mr. President, on behalf of the American Bar Association, we respectfully urge that you lend your own tremendous prestige, great reservoir of confidence and personal affection and unbounded energy to establishing a precedent that: "Judicial appointments should be completely removed from the area of political patronage and made only from those lawyers and judges, irrespective of party affiliation and political consideration, who possess the highest qualifications.

"Suggestions for nomination should originate in an independent commission established as an agency of the President, to advise with the President on appointments, and to receive from outside sources and from all segments of the organized bar, suggestions of names of persons deemed highly

[7] The Federalist, No. 66.

[8] See footnote 2.

[9] Journal, American Judicature Society, August 1957, vol. 41, No. 2, at p. 37.

[10] Journal, American Judicature Society, October 1958, vol. 42, No. 3, at p. 91.

[11] American Bar Association resolution, footnote 5.

qualified for appointment as judges in their respective jurisdictions.

"The 'nominations' of all persons to serve as members of the Federal judiciary should rest solely in the President of the United States; and the U.S. Senators in a spirit of unselfish public service should restrict themselves to their constitutional duty of conducting thorough investigations, and expressing their considered judgment, on the qualifications of the nominees.

"To avoid any suggestion of partisanship and to make the courts truly nonpartisan or bipartisan, it is desirable that there should be some recognition of a general principle that a substantial percentage of the members of any Federal court should be from the ranks of a party other than that of the President who is to make the appointment."

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I believe my colleague from New York has rendered the country a real service in the analysis which he has made.

Second, when we undertook to poll the bar associations of our State, we did so in utmost good conscience, in terms of our being both lawyers and Senators representing our State and the Nation. I am proud of what we did. I fully support my colleague in standing by the action. I join with him in a sense of gratification that what we did was considered a service by the Attorney General. I cannot see how it can be considered brash or unseemly for Senators who are required to confirm appointments to busy themselves with trying to find the best qualified men, especially when the President has invited such action.

Furthermore, a considerable amount of cynicism was involved in not expanding the number of Federal judges for a very long time, notwithstanding the best efforts of my colleague and myself, he in the other body and in the Senate, and I here, together with many other Senators. So I do not believe those who are parties to that operation have any right to talk about cynicism, or anything being done that is unseemly.

Finally, my colleague has pointed out the core of this entire proposal. One-third of the number of judges of the United States will be newly appointed. The very weight of that number of appointments completely outweighs any party or other considerations which might normally enter the mind of the new President.

The President has an enormous responsibility. I think it is our duty to contribute to enabling him to carry it with the greatest credit to the country, in every way we can.

I again express my appreciation to my colleague from New York for his knowledge of this subject and for his research into it, and for presenting the matter as forcibly as he has. It will be an honor for me to continue as his brother in arms until the job is done properly for the American people.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful to my distinguished colleague from New York for the very fine remarks he has made and for his stalwart position in support of what both of us feel is right and just. I stress again that I know he shares my hope and my expectation that the President of the United States will welcome this material in the same way that the Attorney General has greeted it. We have no reason for believing that the President will do anything other than endeavor to select outstanding men for Federal judgeships.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF FINLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are privileged today to have in the Senate Chamber a delegation of 10 from the Parliament of Finland. The delegation has been at luncheon with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and other Senators. We have had a very delightful gathering, and have had an opportunity to become acquainted with these fine men, who represent the great and courageous country of Finland.

The people of the United States hold the people of Finland in the highest esteem and respect. Finland has demonstrated her passion for freedom and independence. She has exhibited the qualities of leadership and understanding that have marked her as a great nation.

The people of Finland, in peace and in war, have been steadfast to the purposes of freedom and democratic government.

We are highly honored to have the representatives of the Finnish Parliament with us. The parliamentary group represents the Social Democratic Party, the Swedish Party, the Agrarian Party—which is now the Government party, the Liberal Party, and the Conservative Party.

The spokesman for the Finnish parliamentary group was the Honorable Toivo Antero Wiherheimo. He was the parliamentary spokesman at our luncheon.

The other members of the delegation are as follows:

Hon. Kalervo Feliks Haapasalo, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Social Democratic Party); editor in chief, Vapaus, Mikkelo.

Hon. Sven Axel Hogstrom, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Swedish Party); judge, Raseborg judicial district.

Hon. Nestori Johannes Kaasalainen, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Agrarian Party); farmer.

Hon. Esa Heikki Kaitila, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Liberal Party); assistant professor of economics, University of Helsinki.

Hon. Niilo Vilho Kosola, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Conservative Party); farmer.

Hon. Lars Sebastian Lindeman, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Social Democratic Party); secretary, Finnish-Swedish Trade Union; agricultural editor, Arbetarbladet.

Hon. Atte Mikael Johannes Pakkanen, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Agrarian Party); director, Finnish Association of Savings Banks); agronomist.

Hon. Jussi Jaakko Saukkonen, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Conservative Party); headmaster, secondary school, Helsinki.

Hon. Arvo Tuominen, Member of the Finnish Parliament (Social Democratic Party); editor in chief, Kansan Lehti, Tampere.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in a hearty, enthusiastic, and cordial welcome to this distinguished group of parliamentarians. [Applause, Senators rising.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR HENRIK VOS, THE NETHERLANDS; AND HON. GUNNAR HECKSCHER, MEMBER OF THE SWEDISH RIKSDAG

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, have escorted two parliamentarians into the Chamber, who are guests, the Honorable Gunnar Heckscher, member of the Riksdag of Sweden; and the Honorable Henrik Vos, a senator from the Netherlands. They are here in the United States in connection with the parliamentary activities of the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. They are seated behind us in the Chamber. [Applause, Senators rising.]

IMPORTATION OF CUBAN MOLASSES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate two telegrams that have been sent to the President today in regard to a shipment of molasses from Cuba which is being unloaded in New Orleans today. Some months ago, the Publicker Industries, of Philadelphia, requested our Department of Agriculture to sell them surplus corn at greatly reduced prices in order to convert it into alcohol. The implied threat was made by Publicker Industries that, unless negotiations were successful in getting the Department to sell them this surplus corn at reduced prices, they would make every effort to obtain the necessary molasses from Cuba.

For the last 4 or 5 months now I have been advocating a complete embargo on all trade between our country and Cuba. Here we are confronted with a situation today that to me is intolerable. Today, there is being unloaded in the city of New Orleans a tanker-load of molasses from Cuba, notwithstanding the fact that negotiations are being carried on by Publicker Industries with the Department of Agriculture for this surplus grain. The Department had entered into these negotiations in good faith, but apparently, Publicker Industries wanted more.

I wish to read into the RECORD two telegrams sent to the President as well as to Mr. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce:

The telegram is dated today, and it reads:

We wish to protest in strongest possible manner recent action by Publicker Industries in importing into New Orleans tanker-load of Cuban molasses which we understand is being unloaded today. It is our understanding that the Department of Agriculture was negotiating with Publicker in good faith to arrive at terms to provide them with surplus grain for conversion into alcohol; yet, at the same time this company in defiance of President's request is importing black strap molasses from Cuba at a price substantially lower than other importers have paid.

Your prompt action to halt this shipment would be appreciated.

The telegram is signed by me, by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as well as by HALE BOGGS and E. E. WILLIS, Members of Congress.

A few minutes thereafter I had a telegram dispatched to the President, with copies going to the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and the Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, as follows:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

With reference to our earlier telegram concerning shipment of Cuban molasses into New Orleans by Publicker Industries, it is now our understanding that the shipment currently being unloaded is only one of a number planned by Publicker. Since there is no other alternative, we respectfully request at this time that you invoke the Trading With the Enemy Act to halt this and future shipments of black strap molasses from Cuba.

This telegram is signed by me, by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and by HALE BOGGS and E. E. WILLIS, Members of Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield to my other colleague from Louisiana, with the same understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for permitting me to engage in this colloquy. I have a meeting of the Appropriations Committee to attend, and he was most kind to allow me the opportunity to speak at this time.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask my friend if he does not find himself confused to find Castro firmly back in the saddle again? Some of us though that this administration had found Castro to be unfriendly. Apparently, whether the tractors-for-prisoners deal goes through or not, Castro is now in charge and now has the American market available to him, for whatever he wishes to send to America, with the full backing of American industry.

From time to time, this Nation should act with some degree of unanimity. We should not make way for people who have current demands for some selfish advantage in dealing with the Cuban Government.

Perhaps the administration will be able to stand up to Castro for a change, and tell him that market is no longer his. Certainly in the absence of Castro making a deal on tractors that should be done, since he is holding it up at this time.

Where has this procedure been authorized. Who gave authority for the deal?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated a moment ago, in order to preclude the Publicker Industries from going to Cuba for the molasses, an effort was made to sell them surplus grain. The company took the position that if we were able to let them have the surplus grain at reduced rates, they would not purchase the molasses from Cuba. But notwithstanding the fact that efforts are now being made to meet the demands of Publicker Industries, and that negotiations are underway between their representatives and those of the Department of Agriculture, they have maneuvered to such an extent that they have obtained this molasses from Cuba. It strikes me that the President should make every effort and should use all the power at his command to prevent this. As I said, the longer we feed that scoundrel from Cuba, the stronger he will get and the more trouble we will have with him.

It is my hope that the President will take action now—not tomorrow, but now, because the molasses is being unloaded now, and there is more to come. The more trade we have with Castro the stronger he will get. I simply cannot understand it. I am puzzled.

We sent these telegrams to the President in the hope that he will act immediately.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator not agree that this is a great victory for Castro? This Government is so big and unwieldy that Castro can continue to raid the American market notwithstanding the fact that he is no longer acceptable to some quarters?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot understand why that action is taken. The Publicker Industries must have some great amount of influence, to be able to buy this product from Castro notwithstanding the fact that they are still negotiating to buy this surplus grain. I cannot understand it. It is a puzzling situation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before yielding to my colleague from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] I wish to say to the Senators from Louisiana that I agree with them thoroughly. Long before this we should have ended all trade with Castro's Communist government. The sooner we come to a realization that this step must be taken, the better it will be for all concerned.

I am very happy that the two Senators from Louisiana and their House colleagues have joined in sending a forceful telegram on the subject to the President. I hope it will get the desired results.

Mr. President, I now yield, with the same understanding, to my good friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senators from Louisiana and the Senator from New York in protesting any trade with Castro. It is indefensible that we in the United States should be buying molasses or anything else from Castro, particularly since many officials in high places in the Government are criticizing our neighbors to the north for carrying on trade with this same Cuban regime.

I have no brief whatever for the Publicker Industries' point of view that if they cannot get cheap corn or subsidized corn from the Government in order to manufacture their products they shall insist upon the right to trade with Cuba. So far as I am concerned, we should stop all trade with Cuba, and at the same time we should let Publicker Industries pay the regular price for corn in the United States. Certainly we should not be held up by blackmail in our own country with the position that we have to subsidize the alcohol industry in this country in order to keep it from trading with Cuba. The time has come when the President and the administration should stop the Cuban trade—period—and let Publicker and other companies buy American products and pay American prices.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before resuming my remarks I wish to say it is my understanding that all the colloquy on unrelated subjects will be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

FORMER VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S ARTICLE ON THE MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING THE NATION AND THE FREE WORLD

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in this morning's edition of the Washington Post appears the first in a series of 10 articles to be published in the coming year by Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States. This first article is of particular timeliness and importance, because it places the finger squarely on the major problem facing this Nation and the free world today. That problem is one of firmness of our national will to resist the aggression of the Communist world—a willingness to fight, if necessary, to maintain our freedom.

Mr. Nixon well points out the long-recognized principle that when dealing with Communists action and not words is what counts. We learned at the cost of thousands of casualties in the Korean war that the slightest indication on our part that we are unwilling to fight will be interpreted by the Soviets as a green light to more aggression. Such a miscalculation results in war.

I must say that I am deeply disturbed over the negative results of the recent summit meeting, so-called, in Vienna. If the purpose of this meeting, as far as the administration is concerned, was to convince Premier Khrushchev that we mean business when we say that we will not permit Communist aggression, direct or indirect, as far as Berlin and other sensitive areas of the world are concerned, then this purpose has failed miserably—so miserably that it might well be that we would be better off had the Vienna meeting not taken place at all—at least at this time. The principal result of this meeting appears to be that Premier Khrushchev became convinced that we would back down on Berlin, and so he gave the President his timetable which is to have the Berlin problem settled—in the Soviet way—by the end of this year.

If the purpose of this meeting, as far as the administration is concerned, was to obtain cooperation from Premier Khrushchev in working out an agreement for inspection and control in nuclear test ban talks, then this purpose has failed miserably—for the Soviets have called off further talks in this area.

If the purpose of this meeting, as far as the administration is concerned, was to further the cause of peaceful coexistence with the Communists, then this purpose was doomed to failure from the beginning—because there can be no such thing as peaceful coexistence, as we define those words, with an aggressive philosophy dedicated to world domination, with the United States as its number one target.

This is no time for so-called authoritative sources in the administration to suggest that the admission of Red China to the United Nations is inevitable. This is no time for responsible leaders in the administration to suggest a solution to the Berlin problem which, as Mr. Nixon says, has its origins in the war councils of the Soviet Union. This is no time for the President to say "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done," when the American people are, as Mr. Nixon assures us, far ahead of the administration in their willingness and determination to do what is necessary to defend our freedom against aggression.

This, Mr. President, is the time for leadership which matches eloquence in words with decisiveness in deeds. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Nixon be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONVINCE KHRUSHCHEV WE WOULD FIGHT FOR FREEDOM, NIXON SAYS

(By Richard M. Nixon)

It was all but inevitable that Premier Khrushchev would follow up the summit conference by precipitating a new Berlin crisis.

Things have been going too well for the Soviet dictator, in space, in Laos, and even in our own hemisphere, for him to pass the opportunity to return to what he considers to be his No. 1 target of this stage of the cold war—the West German Republic.

No matter how you rationalize it, this is what Khrushchev is after in Berlin—and what he may get, if we falter. A victory in Berlin, no matter how limited, would give Khrushchev the leverage he wants on the mind and spirit of the West Germans. Men will not long oppose the reality of historical inevitability, and Khrushchev well knows this fundamental human truth. If he can shake the faith of the West Germans in the ultimate victory of the free system, he will have opened a major break in the ramparts of the West.

This, then, is the central core of his overall cold-war strategy. It is the explanation of why he returns again and again to the outflanked city of Berlin.

The "bone in the throat," as he calls it, is actually the morsel he would bite off in order to chew at the vitals of the West.

President Kennedy has expressed a great concern that Khrushchev might make a major miscalculation about the will of the West to preserve this exposed outpost of freedom. That essentially is why he sought out the summit conference. He believed that a face-to-face confrontation would set Mr. Khrushchev straight about the will of the West, as it was to be measured in the person of the new President of the United States.

The confrontation has apparently not had the desired effect on Khrushchev. For in his first major utterance since Vienna he has delivered a new ultimatum to the West to be gone from Berlin by the new year. If we do not do so, he threatens to encourage his East German puppet to close the access routes to the city from West Germany by force of Soviet arms.

It is clear that President Kennedy must at the earliest possible time take further measures to convince Khrushchev of what he apparently failed to convince him at the summit—that the United States means what it says about the defense of freedom.

SEES NATION BACKING HIM

I am confident he will have the overwhelming support of the Nation for such measures, if he will but put the facts squarely to the people.

Unfortunately the postsummit stance in Washington has lacked the simplicity and clarity of Khrushchev's arrogant ultimatum. The administration's top leaders in the Senate even have seen fit to suggest weakness rather than strength of will about Berlin by recasting one of Khrushchev's own proposals for making Berlin a free city. To be sure, the revised proposal would make all Berlin, not just West Berlin, a free city.

This means in effect an undefended city, surrounded entirely by major Soviet and Soviet puppet forces, and abandoned by its present Western defenders.

But even if the arrangement were to include East Berlin, which seems highly impractical in Khrushchev's present state of self-assurance, it is quite evident that without the presence of Western troops it would be only a matter of time until the free city of Berlin would fall prey to the Communist action squads.

How could a few hundred thousand Berliners, indomitable as they have been until now, long resist what whole nations like Czechoslovakia could not?

JOB FOR THE PRESIDENT

If this proposal was intended as a trial balloon for administration policy experimentation, as has been reported by Washington correspondents, it should be shot down by the President himself.

If it is intended as a piece of bait to tempt Khrushchev into demanding a new conference on Berlin, it is equally dangerous. We have already discovered that Khrushchev is not impressed by mere reiteration of our determination. He is much too tough and ruthless to mistake verbiage for the real thing.

The sad truth is that there is no pat solution for the Berlin situation any more than there is for any other of the tough situations that confront us around the world today and will continue to confront us as long as the Communists remain what they are, aggressors, zealots, intent on domination of the entire world.

Yet there is a way of dealing with the kind of aggression which communism presents. This is not communism's first attempt to grab Berlin. Most of us living today still remember the airlift victory over Stalin's blockade of the city.

Nor is this Khrushchev's first ultimatum that the West quit Berlin. As long ago as November 1958, Khrushchev made an identical demand.

THREAT FIRMLY REJECTED

Then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles rejected the threat firmly. His critics began speaking of brinkmanship and the peril of war and the substitution of so-called flexibility for strength of will and conscience. The parade of Soviet pressures marched on just as today.

Finally, on the 27th of November 1958, came Khrushchev's proposal to make West Berlin a free city. Today let us not forget that this free city idea had its origins not in the Senate of the United States, but in the war councils of the Soviet Union.

It was on the same day and in the same pronouncement that Khrushchev delivered his first ultimatum on Berlin. Then, as now, he gave the West 6 months to pick up and get out on his terms.

What happened? The West held firm. The Soviets backed down. The political realists of the Soviet must evaluate the cost of war and the timing of war just as coldly as we must. And the cold facts are that we are in Berlin. It requires no aggressive action to stay in Berlin. It is upon the heads of the Soviet leaders that a decision to use force to change the situation must always rest.

Failure in Berlin would be a failure of nerve in a war of nerves. We have won battle after battle in that war in West Berlin. The alternatives remain the same. The option is ours. Stand firm or get out. Soviet threats to push us out carry no more weight today than they did in the past. It is our will that is being tested, not theirs.

This ill-timed free-city proposal is the latest of a series of events that have weakened America's position of world leadership since this administration came into office. Grave doubts may have been raised in Khrushchev's mind as to America's will and determination to resist his aggressive actions.

In Laos, we talked big and backed down when the chips were down. As a result, the whole American position in Southeast Asia has been jeopardized. And, unless, we soon find a time and a place to back up our words with action, the other nations in that vitally important area will be gobbled up by the Communists one by one.

In Cuba, we committed our prestige and failed at the critical moment to commit our power. As a result, we witness the sorry spectacle of American citizens asking for the privilege of paying blackmail to the pipsqueak dictator who not only holds 1,200 freedom fighters in prison, but who is wiping out the last vestiges of freedom for the 5 million people of Cuba.

In the atomic-test talks, we made additional concessions in the hope of getting an agreement. The Communist negotiators, as we should have expected, merely accepted our concessions and made their own previously unacceptable proposals even more unacceptable.

America has never known a time in its history when we have spoken more bravely and eloquently and acted with more indecision and timidity.

It has been suggested that we could not back up our words with action because we lacked the military power to do so. This is nonsense. Our defeats in Laos and in Cuba were not due to a lack of American power but to a lack of American will.

President Kennedy has asked for more money for defense. I believe the Congress should appropriate whatever funds are necessary to maintain our military strength at adequate levels. But our greatest need today if we are to turn back the Communist offensive against freedom is not more missiles, more guns, and more planes, but more will to use our power where necessary in the cause of freedom.

Nor can the American people be blamed for these failures. President Kennedy could not have been more mistaken when he said recently in Chicago: "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done." The American people are far ahead of the administration in their willingness and determination to do what is necessary to defend our freedom against aggression.

Nor can inaction be excused on the ground that a course of firmness would lead to war. We have learned from history that in dealing with a dictator the greatest danger of war arises when he is willing to risk war to gain his objective and he becomes convinced that his opponents are not willing to take the risk in order to defend the areas of freedom from his aggression.

Every time an aggressor bluffs and the defenders back down, he is encouraged to become more aggressive still. Eventually he pushes too far—and war inevitably results.

Mr. Khrushchev knows the destructive power of modern weapons just as well as we do. He fears the consequences of war as much as we do. But the only way to avoid war in dealing with him or any other aggressive dictator is to make it clear at all times that while we are always willing to negotiate our differences we will do so from strength and not weakness and that we are just as determined to fight for freedom as he appears to be determined to fight against it.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommitteee on Reorganization and International Organization of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday of this week, to conduct hearings on bills to establish a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of my able friend from Minnesota whether this matter has been cleared with the minority?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe it has. It is normal procedure. I do not know whether the Senate will be in session on Wednesday and Thursday. However, I will wait until we check with the minority.

SECRETARY UDALL SPELLS OUT NEED OF YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower in support of establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, such as I have proposed in my bill, S. 404.

I take this opportunity to commend Secretary Udall for this excellent statement spelling out the benefits which our country will derive from such a corps. If anyone has any doubts as to whether a YCC would be doing useful work, I urge him to read Secretary Udall's testimony and the estimates made by the Department of the Interior of the number of young men that could be put to work on various projects just within the Department of the Interior itself. The estimate would indicate that my bill, S. 404, which provides for a YCC of 50,000 young men in the first year, and a top of 150,000 after 3 years, is, if anything, far too little to do the job that has to be done.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Secretary Udall's statement and estimate of the number of corpsmen that could be used by the Department be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL ON S. 404 AND S. 2036 BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND WELFARE, JUNE 20, 1961

I am quite certain you all know how I feel about the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. But to make the record clear, let me state my position without qualification.

I favor the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

A Youth Conservation Corps would conserve and develop the capacities of our two most precious national assets—our youth and our natural resources. From a modest beginning, carefully shaping the developing program to today's needs, I believe the Department of the Interior alone can provide useful work experience and training for a corps of thousands of young men.

For youth, a soundly operating Youth Conservation Corps will provide employment on useful work that gives dignity to those performing it.

It will develop constructive work habits.

It will provide, informally, on-the-job training in use of a variety of tools and simple machines.

It will offer an opportunity for additional classrooms and other training and education outside of work hours.

It will provide a living experience of established merit in helping young men get along with others and with themselves.

It will instill an appreciation of the natural world and an understanding of the land and our dependence upon it.

It will build strong bodies.

For the Nation, a soundly operating Youth Conservation Corps will yield a high percentage of young men better equipped to earn and maintain a useful place in society.

It will spread public understanding of our natural resources and conservation.

It will ease the explosive combination of young men concentrated in urban areas with nothing constructive to do.

Finally—and this is the value that elevates the corps to high levels of usefulness—a sound Youth Conservation Corps under the supervision of experienced Federal and State conservation agencies can provide the American people with more enjoyable park and recreation lands, more productive forests, more fish and game, cleaner streams, better protected watersheds.

In short, a corps can help provide over years, even decades, a more abundant and more enjoyable life for us and for generations to come through the conservation of natural resources.

These twin benefits—to youth and to the public—must both be considered in evaluating the corps program.

S. 404, Senator HUMPHREY's fine bill, is exclusively a Youth Conservation Corps measure.

The administration bill, S. 2036, includes a Youth Conservation Corps, and also provides for programs of on-the-job training and local public service training and employment. I am not an expert in these fields, but—before going on to document our case for a corps—I would like to say that it makes good sense to me to use more than one approach to the problems of our unemployed young people. Secretary Goldberg made a strong case for the administration's three-part program when he appeared before you last week, and I hope you were persuaded of the program's basic soundness.

But it is the Youth Conservation Corps that is of most interest to me, both as Secretary of the Department that carries the major Federal responsibility for conserving and managing our resources, and as an individual who believes that there is nothing healthier for the minds and bodies of young men than hard work outdoors.

This personal conviction has been strengthened by the testimony of many who saw and were inspired by the results of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, especially Conrad L. Wirth, now Director of the National Park Service and one of the Nation's great conservation figures. As many of you know, Connie was a key figure in Interior's work in the CCC. He was in the program from beginning to end.

I want to emphasize to you that Connie is of the firm opinion still—after nearly two decades—that the CCC was a sound and productive program for young men and for natural resources.

At the end of the CCC program, Connie made a final report to Secretary Ickes in which he documented the far-reaching conservation accomplishments of CCC on Interior lands. As Connie noted, "Perhaps one of the greatest accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps was that it brought to the minds of the people of this country the need and value of a sound active conservation program."

It is my strong belief that this same understanding is even more important today, and our very survival in the long run may well depend on our willingness and ability to conserve and use wisely our national resources. There is one other passage in Connie's report I would like to quote to you on the relationship of the work to those performing it:

"The work necessary to conserve and protect these natural resources can generally be performed best by the establishment of camps. In the case of the CCC, the camps brought together groups of boys who were taught to work, live, and play, with common interests and community respect.

"Working in the open, with nature, brings optimum beneficial results to an individual which are almost impossible to obtain otherwise. It builds the body and the mind; it teaches the basic principles of existence; and it creates an understanding of what must be done to protect and properly use natural resources."

There is impressive evidence all around us—in maturing trees, in trails and bridges, protected hillsides, popular campgrounds—of the lasting public benefits of the CCC.

Unhappily, there is equally impressive evidence of the tremendous backlog of conservation work that has piled up over the years since the abandonment of the Civilian Conservation Corps. We are continuing to fall behind, at an alarming rate, in reforestation, reseeding of our rangelands, improvement and protection of our watersheds, and other soil and moisture conservation measures essential to the protection and sound development of our natural resources. The present need is intensified by the fact that time has had its way with many conservation improvements and recreation facilities constructed by the CCC, and rebuilding is necessary.

While our performance has lagged, the pressures on our resources have mounted. Increased population, higher living standards and foreign commitments are placing unprecedented demands on our basic natural resources. People with more leisure time, more money to spend and increased mobility are crowding open spaces which in turn are being preempted for industry, housing, highway and other purposes. We must, therefore, move without delay to act as responsible stewards of these resources through wise and vigorous conservation programs. Let me say flatly that young men in camp operations could be invaluable help in this job. A Youth Conservation Corps would not replace any adult workers in regular programs. The type of work contemplated for

a corps is either not being done, or being done inadequately today, and I might note that it is frequently impossible to hire regular workers for the work.

These are the broad generalizations which I feel justify the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps as proposed in the legislation. But our needs in the Department of the Interior are specific. There are five bureaus—the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs—with extensive lands and facilities in serious need of work suited to the talents and limitations of a Youth Conservation Corps. Estimates compiled by these bureaus reveal the need for camp operations in almost all States of the Union.

The Department has prepared, at the request of the chairman, a summary of the kinds and amounts of work that can be done by enrollees in a Youth Conservation Corps. This information is attached; I will highlight it here.

You will note, and I emphasize, that the Department of the Interior alone has work, useful work, sufficient to occupy many thousands of young men for a period of years. The pilot program proposed in S. 2036 will, we trust, establish the wisdom of expanding the program to the level indicated by our needs.

Here is a partial listing of the types of work that could usefully occupy several thousand enrollees on National Park Service areas: construction of minor roads, trails, camp and picnic grounds; fencing and boundary marking; restoration of historic sites and structures; water supply and storage development; soil and moisture conservation; forest preservation; wildlife control and preservation; and grounds maintenance.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has important work programs which would center on the national wildlife refuges, devoted to the preservation and production of waterfowl, game animals and birds, and rare and endangered species of all types.

The projects would be similar to those listed above, and would include also construction and maintenance of impoundments, nesting islands and potholes for waterfowl, dune control, habitat improvement, control of noxious plants, construction and repair of public recreation facilities and other structures, and soil and moisture conservation measures.

The national land reserve of 477 million acres in 11 States, under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, presents excellent opportunities for constructive and, in some areas, desperately needed work in fire prevention and protection, construction and maintenance of roads, trails, recreational sites, detention dams, reservoirs and fences. Reforestation, range rehabilitation, and soil and moisture conservation projects would also be part of a corps program.

The Bureau of Reclamation has recreation-rich shorelines and other project lands under its jurisdiction in need of soil and moisture conservation, control of phreatophytes and other undesirable vegetation, road and trail construction and maintenance, campsite and building maintenance, and the development of recreational facilities on Reclamation projects.

A properly functioning Youth Conservation Corps would be of unique significance to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and would bring far-reaching and beneficial results for the Indians of the United States. Here, the program would have a threefold purpose—the employment of Indian youth, the training of Indians in leadership and management, and the highly important work in the development and conservation of natural resources on Indian lands.

The needs which such a program would help to meet have been documented and publicized extensively. This administration is making a determined effort to help solve the problems which have plagued our Indian citizens. Among these, neglect of the Indians' resources is one of the major obstacles to a fuller life for Indians. We are determined that Indian reservations shall be developed to their full potential for the benefit of the Indians. A Youth Conservation Corps with camps on Indian reservations would be an invaluable supplement to the regular programs of the bureau.

The work would follow the same pattern as that proposed by other bureaus of the Department. The character of Indian lands, with large areas of forest and range is ideally suited to the program.

I think it is clear that the establishment of a sound Youth Conservation Corps has the unqualified support of the Department of the Interior. We have evidence of our ability to use the work of Youth Conservation Corps enrollees to the advantage of the American people by improving the land, water, forest and recreational resources of the Nation—and, our judgment tells us, to the advantage of the enrollees themselves.

I commend again to your attention the fact that, in S. 2036, the administration proposes a pilot approach to the entire matter of youth employment and training opportunities. The pilot corps has our enthusiastic and vigorous support. The pilot program will permit informed judgment on whether or not the Youth Conservation Corps serves the interests of young people and sound resource conservation in the sixties as it did in the thirties. Lessons learned in the pilot program will improve efficiency of operation of an expanded program if—as we anticipate—the Youth Conservation Corps is found to be worthy of long-term support as a way to conserve young men and the Nation's resources.

I want to end these remarks by expressing my appreciation to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for his pioneering efforts to establish a modern Youth Conservation Corps. We are now close to realizing the fruits of his long labors, and we are all in his debt.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR PROPOSED YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—DESCRIPTION OF NEEDED WORK AND ESTIMATES OF NUMBERS OF ENROLLEES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

(Numbers of enrollees (with exception of the Bureau of Reclamation, which estimates a gradual decline after the first year) represent estimated average enrollment for first 10-year period)

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Estimated number of camps, 129.

Estimated number of enrollees, man-years per year, 15,000.

Proposed Projects: Capital improvements

Camp and picnic grounds

Will consist of providing new camp and picnic grounds and the rehabilitation of some existing sites. It involves grounds preparation and installation of such facilities as fireplaces, picnic tables, etc. Enrollees would acquire skill in masonry and carpenter trades and elementary landscaping. Total estimated, 9,820 sites.

Minor structures and signs

Includes the construction of small structures such as trail shelters, footbridges, comfort stations, ranger cabins, fire lookouts, etc. Also the construction and erection of signs. This work will provide excellent training for enrollees in simple wood, concrete and stone masonry construction, and equipment usage. Total estimated, 9,945 signs and structures.

Historical and archeological work

Archeological remains in many known sites are threatened with damage or loss through construction activities, or inundation by lakes created by new dams. There are also protected sites that need further investigation and preservation. Much common and skilled labor is needed for digging, salvaging, preserving these sites and the artifacts taken therefrom. Also this Service has numerous historic structures and sites that need preserving. In many instances partial or total restoration of historic structures is planned. This project affords excellent enrollee training opportunities in several scientific fields, research, use of hand tools, etc. Total estimated, 858 man-years.

New minor roads and trails

This is the construction of back country roads and trails for fire control, ranger protection work, saddle horse use, visitor hiking, and other miscellaneous management purposes. The type and standard to be determined by the particular need. Enrollees would be trained in the use of handtools, light and heavy equipment. Total estimated, 1,153 miles.

General grounds improvements

This work consists of the developing and improving of grounds around existing structures such as historic homes, memorials, monuments, etc., and those grounds surrounding new park developments such as visitor centers, beaches in recreation areas, etc. The usual landscaping chores are all involved, such as grading, seeding, sodding, fertilizing, planting, drainage, etc. Much "pick and shovel" work is required. Enrollee training would consist of hand and power tools use, light and heavy equipment and landscaping. Total estimated, 2,159 man-years.

Boundary marking and fencing

Many areas of the national park system have inadequate boundary marking and in some cases none at all. Work includes surveying, monumenting, signing, and in some instances the erection of fencing. Enrollees will learn survey and mapping work. Total estimated, 5,146 miles.

Water supply and storage

Many of our wilderness areas need small water sources developed in the back country for use by campers, hikers, ranger patrols, wildlife, and forest-fire fighting. Enrollees would acquire skills in woodmanship and the use of hand tools. Total estimated, 659 projects.

Maintenance

Forest protection

Park forests require protection from insects, diseases, fire, wildlife, the elements, and man. Application of prevention and corrective measures entail treatment of diseased and insect infested trees; detection, suppression, and prevention of fires; seeding and planting to rehabilitate denuded areas and to prevent soil erosion; construction of small water detentions or spreaders; pruning, thinning, and doing other tree cultural work. All of these are outdoor activities in which the enrollees will acquire skills in woodmanship, use of hand tools, and power equipment, land surveying, and map reading. Total estimated, 742 man-years.

Vista clearing

This project consists of selective trimming, cutting, and removal of trees and bushes along the parkways, roads and trails so that visitors may better see and enjoy the parks. Training would be in the use of hand tools, simple landscaping and forestry practices. Total estimated, 1,480 miles.

Grounds maintenance

Thousands of acres of developed grounds in national memorials, cemeteries, military parks, around historic homes, etc., require special treatment such as mowing, seeding, sodding, tree and shrub pruning and preservation, trimming around headstones, etc. Enrollees would acquire skills in the use of hand tools, light equipment, and simple landscape techniques. Total estimated, 2,041 man-years.

Roads and trails maintenance

Many miles of roads and trails in the 190 parks and other areas require daily attention involving roadside cleanup, maintenance of road shoulders, drainage measures, patching, removal of trees and brush from trails, painting, and repair of bridges, etc. This project would train enrollees in several skills and the use of equipment. Total estimated, 3,312 miles.

Soil and moisture conservation

Many acres of park lands have and are deteriorating from man's use. Conservation measures are needed to restore historic farm lands, or natural conditions in scenic parks. Seeding, fertilizing, stabilizing, and maintenance of water run-off facilities are needed. Some minor structures would be built. Both hand tools and mechanized methods would be used in training enrollees. Total estimated, 945 man-years.

Wildlife control and protection

This is a major management responsibility in more than 50 parks. It involves research, census taking, food habit studies, migration studies, reduction of high population of animals, restoration of rare species, destruction or removal of exotics, fish planting, etc. This project would train enrollees in several types of scientific and manual endeavors. Total estimated, 233 man-years.

Building maintenance

Consists of maintaining by carpentry, masonry, and painting a portion of the numerous buildings located in the national park system. Training would be given enrollees in these trades. Total estimated, 2,893 buildings.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE; BRANCH OF WILDLIFE REFUGES

Estimated number of camps, 53.

Estimated number of enrollees, man-years per year, 6,380.

Proposed projects—Capital improvements

Impoundments

Includes the construction of levees, water control structures, canals, ditches, drains, spillways, irrigation systems, pipelines and pumps. Enrollee training would consist of learning to operate heavy and light equipment, such as dozers, draglines, concrete mixers, and dump trucks. They would learn how to water and dewater pools, and do mapping and survey work. Total estimated: 883 miles dikes, 1,664 structures.

Biological

Consist of mechanical, chemical and hand control or removal of brush, trees, and pest plants. Construct nesting islands and potholes for waterfowl, plow, disc, and otherwise prepare lands for cropping purposes, build wood duck nesting boxes. Enrollee training would be in operating equipment, mapping, timber stand improvement, soil surveys, water analysis, rough fish removal, use of explosives, and general soil and water conservation. Total estimated: Nesting islands 1,475, habitat improvement 422,553 acres.

Roads, trails, fences, and utilities

Build roads and trails from improved paved-type to truck trails, construct bridges, fencing, electric and telephone lines. Enrollees would learn how to use miscellaneous equipment. They would grade and shape roads, haul gravel, string wire on utility lines, build barbed or woven wire fencing, survey and post refuge boundaries, use boating equipment. Total estimated: Construct 93 bridges, 1,699 miles fencing, 1,111 miles road.

Recreation

Would include construction of vitally needed information centers, picnic tables, fireplaces, boat ramps, parking areas, display pools, restrooms, campgrounds, roadside signs. Enrollee would be trained in building all of above functions, use equipment and hand tools, plus design, drafting and mapping work. Total estimated: 253 campsites, 1,867 picnic tables, restrooms, and so forth.

Maintenance

Buildings and facilities

Would maintain all buildings by painting, building repairs, floor sanding, cleaning wells, renovating water distribution systems. Enrollee would be trained in roofing buildings, painting, and use of carpenter tools. Total estimated: 986 buildings.

Roads and trails, fencing

Rebuild truck trails, patrol roads, and fencing. Training would be in use of maintenance equipment and tools. Total estimated: 3,475 miles road, 2,703 miles fencing, 5,704 miles posting.

Biological

Farm croplands, censusing wildlife, banding birds, fire suppression and presuppression. Enrollee would be trained in all up-to-date farming and fire suppression methods. Total estimated: 6,417,000 miles grassland, 950,000 acres forest, 87,000 acres cropland.

Dikes, levees, canals

Repair levees, canals, ditches, damaged by floods or by burrowing animals. Enrollees would trap burrowing animals, and learn to use miscellaneous equipment. Total estimated: 2,351 miles levees, 2,565 structures, 433 bridges.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Estimated number of camps, 110.

Estimated number of enrollees, man-years per year, 10,000.

Proposed projects, capital improvements

Forest development

Includes such activities as brush removal and other site clearing for reforestation. It also includes direct seeding of tree seed, the planting of tree seedlings, and stand improvement work which is thinning and pruning of the timber stand. Enrollee training would consist of surveying, mapping soil conservation, and horticultural techniques. Total estimated, 7,582,192 acres.

Trail construction

Will be the building of livestock trails over difficult terrain in order to provide access for livestock from feed to water. It will also be the building of recreation trails in wild areas. Trainees will learn surveying, mapping, and possible use of explosives. Total estimated, 2,133 miles.

Road and bridge construction

Will consist of the building of roads from the highest standards to the lowest jeep trail. Bridges vary from large concrete structures to small log stringer types. Enrollee training will be the use of heavy equipment, engineering and design, surveying, mapping, and drafting. Total estimated, 21,571 miles of road, 1,066 bridges.

Fence construction

Is the building of standard four-wire fences for the control of livestock and intensive management, for protection of seedings, and in some cases to keep livestock from densely infested areas of poisonous weeds. Enrollee training would consist of surveying, mapping, and construction methods. Total estimated, 116,125 miles.

Range seeding

Is the seeding of perennial grasses on prepared sites in the range areas. Enrollee training would cover surveying, mapping, equipment use, and soil conservation. Total estimated, 12,323,000 acres.

Brush control

Consists of the mechanical and chemical control of brush species which have a natural grass understory. This activity would train the enrollees in equipment use, surveying, mapping and soil conservation. Total estimated, 32,283,000 acres.

Water management

Covers the construction of large detention dams, diversion dams, waterspreading dikes, stockwater reservoirs, spring developments, wells and pipelines. Enrollees would be trained in equipment use, soil and water conservation, surveying and mapping. Total estimated, 64,575 projects.

Buildings and facilities

Include the construction of some badly needed buildings of our various district headquarters as well as fire stations and lookouts. Some buildings and many facilities will be built for the recreation program. These will run from elaborate camping grounds with running water, latrines, fireplaces, tables, etc. to the simple roadside stop. Enrollees will learn wood, concrete and stone masonry construction, equipment usage, design, surveying, mapping and drafting. Total estimated, 21,755 projects.

Maintenance

Roads and trails

Will be the maintaining of present and newly constructed roads and trails. Primary training will be the use of equipment. Total estimated, 586,268 miles.

Fence maintenance

Is the maintaining and/or reconstruction of portions of existing and newly constructed fences. Training will be primarily the use of small tools. Total estimated, 123,103 miles.

Maintenance of buildings and facilities

Is the maintaining of all existing and newly constructed buildings and facilities described under construction above. Training would consist of use of small tools and painting. Total estimated, 22,127 projects.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Estimated number of camps, 148.

Estimated number of enrollees, man-years per year, 6,052.

Proposed projects, capital improvements

1. Conservation of natural resources on reclamation lands

Will include seeding of grasses to control and prevent erosion; operation of tree nurseries and planting seeds, seedlings and cuttings of trees; stream channelization and bank stabilization; building of small dams, jetties, chutes, flumes, and other water control structures; dune planting; building and placing of wind erosion barriers; making fire breaks and fighting grass fires; building protective fences; construction of log booms or comparable devices across streams and reservoirs for collection of debris; and any other land or reservoir treatments to aid in conserving our natural resources and the protection of irrigation structures. Enrollee on the job training will include instruction in the various trades and skills required in the performance of these activities. Total estimated acres, 162,000.

2. Control of undesirable plants

Will include operation of weed control equipment like bulldozers, root rakes, mow-

ers, cutters, spraying devices, burners for mechanical and chemical elimination of undesirable plants such as halogeton, phreatophytes, noxious and poisonous weeds. Where feasible it will include replacement of such plants with grasses and other weed competing plants which will use less water and have an economic value. Enrollee training will include instruction in the skills required in the proper pursual of plant control operations. Total estimated acres, 160,000.

3. New roads

Will consist of the building of roads and parking areas in connection with the recreational use of reservoir areas. These will be mostly access roads not requiring standards of construction to meet heavy traffic requirements. Enrollee training will include the use of heavy equipment, engineering and design, surveying, mapping and drafting. Estimated road mileage, 830.

4. Recreational use areas

Construction of public use facilities at existing reclamation reservoirs by enrollees will vary according to use requirements anticipated for specific areas. Construction will incluude campgrounds, water supplies, sanitary facilities, fireplaces, picnic tables, picnic shelters, boat launching ramps, boat docks, and similar facilities. Enrollees will learn concrete and stone masonry construction along with equipment use, design surveying, mapping and drafting. Total recreation use areas for construction, 148.

Maintenance

1. Conservation of natural resources on reclamation lands

Will include maintenance of erosion control and water saving structure devices and equipment; maintenance of treated areas, and reworking of areas where necessary; and the collection and disposition of debris and repair and upkeep of facilities. Total estimated acres, 34,600.

2. Control of undesirable plants

Will include reworking of treated areas, maintenance of planted areas and unkeep of all equipment, devices, and structures required in the operations. Estimated total acres, 31,300.

3. Road maintenance

Work by enrollees will be that needed to maintain access roads and parking areas in good repair. Work would include handling of materials and use of equipment for this purpose. Total road mileage, 2,375.

4. Maintenance of trails

This work would include maintenance of trails in public use areas of reclamation reservoirs. Enrollees would make periodic inspections of trails and carry out whatever minor maintenance work was required to keep them in good repair for use by the public. Total mileage of trails, 2,850.

5. Cabinsite maintenance

This work would include maintenance of cabinsites used for recreational purposes at existing and future developed public use areas. Enrollees would repair any damage done to facilities along with other work needed consistent with public use interests and primary project needs. Total number cabinsites, 475.

6. Building maintenance

Maintenance program for existing and future buildings constructed for public use purposes will be required. The buildings involved would include those constructed as minimum basic facilities as reclamation reservoirs. Enrollees would be required to carry out whatever work was needed to keep these buildings in proper repair. Total number of buildings, 4,750.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Estimated number of camps	320
Estimated number of enrollees, man-years per year	7,444

Proposed projects, capital improvements

Brush control

Consists of mechanical and chemical control of brush. This practice would afford enrollees training in the use of equipment and chemicals and education on the value of this practice to soil conservation. Total estimated, 2,635,421 acres.

Gully control

This practice consists of various mechanical and vegetative devices to control gullies and protect stream banks. Enrollees would receive training in the use of equipment, concrete work, and various vegetative practices. Total estimated, 566,181 miles.

Pest and weed control

This practice consists of controlling all types of weeds and pests such as prairie dogs, grasshoppers, etc. Enrollees would receive training in the use of equipment and chemicals. Total estimated, 24,793,474 acres.

Tree planting

This practice consists of planting trees for wind breaks, gully control, etc. Enrollees would receive training in the use of mechanical equipment and hand tools. Total estimated, 50,901 acres.

Seeding and sodding

This practice consists of planting seed and sodding range and pasture lands by hand and mechanical means. Enrollees would receive training in the use of equipment and education in agronomy. Total estimated, 3,258,795 acres.

Structures

This practice consists of the building of various structures for the control of soil erosion. Enrollees will receive training in the use of equipment, building materials, etc. Total estimated, 36,899 structures.

Forest regeneration, improvement and protection

Includes forest seeding and planting, thinning, and pruning of reproduction stands, fire hazard reduction, pest control, etc. Enrollee training would consist of forest culture techniques, use of simple tools, elements of forest pathology and entomology and the techniques of fire presuppression and suppression. Total estimated, 1,610,000 acres.

Trails and firebreaks

Includes horse and foot trails, landing strips, and firebreaks. Enrollee training would consist of survey and simple road construction methods. Total estimated, 750 miles construction.

Truck trails construction

Will consist of constructing new and existing truck trails to provide access to Indian lands for forest protection, forest marketing, and recreation. Enrollee training will be the operation and maintenance of heavy construction equipment, bridge construction, and surveying. Total estimated, 7,106 miles.

Water management

Covers construction of detention dams, diversion dams, water spreading dikes, stockwater reservoirs, spring developments, wells and pipelines. Enrollees would be trained in equipment use, concrete and masonry construction. Total estimated, 11,309 projects.

Range improvements

Covers the construction of range boundary and drift fences, corrals, and cattle guards for the control of livestock and intensive management; fences for the protection of seeded areas, water facilities, and range sample plots established for management purposes. Enrollees would be trained in equipment use and concrete construction. Total estimated, 95,210 miles of fence, 3,150 other projects.

Recreational development

Covers the construction of picnic areas and boat landings; wildlife stocking. This work would encourage expanded use of the valuable recreational resources. Enrollees would be trained in equipment use, concrete and masonry construction. Total estimated, 16,689 projects.

Maintenance

Dams

This will include the repair or rehabilitation of various types of erosion control dams. Enrollees will receive training in the use of equipment, building materials, concrete, steel, etc. Total estimated, 168 dams.

Laterals, levees, and dikes

This will consist of rehabilitation and repair of these erosion control structures. Enrollees will receive training in the use of equipment and various materials. Total estimated, 5,333 miles.

Structures

This will consist of repair of the various erosion control structures. Enrollees will receive training in the use of equipment, materials, etc. Total estimated, 83,416 structures.

Trails and firebreaks

Includes horse and foot trails, landing strips and firebreaks. Enrollee training would consist of survey and simple road construction methods. Total estimated, 740 miles maintenance.

FOREIGN POLICY AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S ARTICLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know the Senate wishes to continue with the consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill. However, I should like to make one brief comment.

I listened with keen attention to the comments of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] relating to the article written by Mr. Nixon, as printed in this morning's press. At a later date I shall have something to say about this article. I shall speak in more detail then.

I merely wish the record to be clear on this one point. I know that so far as the Vienna meeting is concerned, the President of the United States made it manifestly clear to the leaders on both sides of the aisle that no concessions were made by the President, that our position on West Berlin is one of firmness and determination, and that we have no intention to sacrifice the freedom of the people of West Berlin; nor do we have any intention of giving up our legal rights for our garrison in West Berlin and our access to West Berlin under the terms of the agreements that relate to that city.

It is misleading to the American people for anyone to indicate that there is any appeasement, any doubt, or any equivocation on the part of the administration.

Senators can make their own comments, as they have in this body. That is our privilege as Senators. However, the President of the United States will ultimately state American policy. He has done so. He has made it abundantly clear. The fact is that before the President went to Vienna, our Government knew that Mr. Khrushchev had taken a

very dogmatic and a very arrogant position on West Berlin now, as he did in 1958.

I was the first American representative in Berlin in November of 1958, after Mr. Khrushchev's ultimatum of November 27, 1958. I was there with Mayor Willie Brandt. I was the first American official to declare, insofar as it was possible for a Senator to do so, our position of determination to resist any Soviet encroachment upon the city of Berlin. I made it manifestly clear as one Senator and as a Democrat to Mr. Khrushchev himself that we had no intention to, and under no circumstances would we, yield to Soviet pressure on West Berlin.

I may say that this is still the position of our Government. I for one do not relish comment by a former Vice President or by anyone else to the effect that the United States is in any way engaging in appeasement or uncertainty. The President of the United States has been very definite about this question. Mr. Khrushchev is again testing our nerve and our strength. He will find that on both sides of the aisle and in all parts of America there is a determination to fulfill our commitments; that we do not run away either from commitments or from danger. We seek no trouble, but we are determined to defend our rights and to protect them.

I simply wish the record to be perfectly clear that that is where I stand. I stand unequivocally for the position of our Government to insist upon our right to access and our presence in West Berlin. We have no intention of sacrificing them for any momentary easing of tensions, for to do so would only cause a mounting of tensions later.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I think the country will welcome the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. I understood the President in that way myself.

I respectfully submit, laying aside the normal feelings of partisanship, that as I read the former Vice President's article, that is what he was trying to say. Sometimes we do not say things so artistically as we might. I really do not believe anyone questions at all the determination which has been expressed on both sides of the aisle. This is very good notice for Mr. Khrushchev and all his henchmen.

However, I believe an entirely legitimate area of discussion was raised by the majority leader concerning whether the time has come, as he put it, to propose a third way for the settlement of the Berlin problem. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] have discussed the question in that spirit. I, too, shall discuss it in the Senate in that spirit. Such discussion is good. Not only must we be firm, but we must be rational, in the interest of the people of America. It is good for us to discuss possible alternatives. Although I myself believe there is no alternative, nevertheless we shall have explored possible alternatives.

I think the country will welcome what the Senator from Minnesota has said. There is no question about his record, just as there is no question about the record of anyone else, on the question of the determination of the United States to stand on its commitments and responsibilities.

I see no harm whatsoever—in fact, I see much good—in discussing what might be done. If the conclusion is reached that there is nothing else to be done than to stand where we are, so much for that. I am one who believes that that is all right; but that does not make it right. However, I believe it is good for the country to have the benefit of our views.

I understand the attitude of the Senator from Minnesota and the attitude of Democrats and Republicans alike who have discussed the question of Berlin in recent days.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from New York, who has made a clear and forthright statement. I, too, welcome the opportunity for discussion. Discussions are helpful and informative. I believe they will solidify our position. In our debates there may be momentary misunderstandings; but I feel certain we will arrive at a consensus. That consensus will be for the security of our country and the fulfillment of our commitments.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

AMERICA'S WORD MUST BE HER BOND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, any Senator has the right—indeed, he has the responsibility—to speak out and voice the honest convictions which are his with respect to the dread, grave questions which confront our free country and the free world. No one is held in higher respect in this Chamber than is the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—a great patriot, a great American, and a great leader in this Chamber. Some of us, however, with great respect, take complete and vigorous exception to the views which he uttered the other day respecting West Berlin. Some have used them to contend—without any warrant or right—I believe and pray—that America may be on the threshold of a new policy on this indomitable German city. Vacillation, Mr. President, is a confession of weakness, of which we cannot and must not be guilty. Evil thrives on the wavering of its adversary.

At best, the reputation of SEATO is tarnished, and the free peoples of Asia soberly ponder its capability of assistance to them in time of emergency and of danger to their freedom. At best, in this hemisphere, the exalted Monroe Doctrine is bruised and bleeding, and the people of this hemisphere and elsewhere may be pardoned for questioning what is the position of the United States in its age old resolve to keep the new world free of alien ideology.

Whence comes the respect for America? It comes solely, as I see it, from the recognition by all nations that a dedicated and unflinching America seeks only peace with justice. When our vaunted decisions on foreign policy are eroded or weakened by vacillation, by equivocation, or by doubt, the free world, confused, is filled with foreboding, while communism smiles. We may, on occasion debate America's foreign policy divisions. But the entire globe must realize that we are a united people, and that our word is our bond. Is this not crucially true respecting Berlin?

I remember the Berlin airlift. I remember the United Nations resolution for a free plebiscite for the peoples in that beleaguered city. I remember, too, the truculent refusal of Communism to permit free elections. I remember the repeated pledge by America that we and our allies would keep Berlin free. How proud our country was. How proud, indeed, was the cause of freedom for this honorable and unyielding resolve.

Some doubts have been created as to where the people and the Government of the United States stand today on Berlin. We may discuss it. It may be debated in this Chamber, but the position of the United States, honorably given and honorably iterated and reiterated throughout the years on this tragic question, must remain the foreign policy of the Government and the people of our country.

Under those circumstances, let the President himself repeat to the country and to the world that we mean what we say; that America's promises are neither hollow nor false. We shall nourish, we shall protect the Berliners, whatever Soviet communism may do with their puppet East German satellite. Let our allies repeat that they, too, stand firm under freedom's banner. Let none, no one, mistake this resolve.

This is not the path of belligerence. It is simply a rededication to those truths which are in America's heart. It may be a little more. It may help to erase an uneasy feeling that we seek peace even without justice.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PREMIER HAYATO IKEDA, OF JAPAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today I had the honor to attend a luncheon given by the distinguished Vice President of the United States for a great world citizen. Premier Hayato Ikeda, of Japan, flew to the Capital of our Nation today to engage in a series of preeminently important discussions with the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State. Americans welcome as an honored guest and as a friend of freedom this distinguished representative of the great Japanese people.

It was only last fall when, as a member of the delegation from this country to the Interparliamentary Union in Japan, a number of us were invited one evening to be the guests of Premier Ikeda. I listened to the gallant and respected representative of the Japanese people as he spoke in his native tongue, and as his speech was translated to us who spoke no Japanese, of how his country loved freedom and wanted it; of how

the great Japanese people desire to strengthen their bonds of amity and friendship and good will with their friends, the people of the United States. Our country, of course, reflects precisely those same exalted and attainable aims.

I feel certain that I speak for all of us as I say, Welcome to the representative of a great nation, and a people who share our aspirations for liberty with justice for all mankind.

The nature of the issues which will be discussed between the heads of our Government and the Japanese Premier will be of a most sensitive nature. The problem of Red China, and the problem of trade relations between the United States and Japan unquestionably will be upon the agenda.

I take it that the people of Japan may be somewhat more flexible in their attitude with respect to the Communist Chinese than we are. But while it may be that some persons in Japan favor trade with Red China, I believe it fair to say that no one in Japan is anxious to contribute at all to the strength or the prestige of that evil Communist government, nor indeed does the Japanese Government desire, willingly or intentionally, to offend their friends, the people of the United States. Nor do we desire at all to offend them.

Mr. President, trade will be important in these discussions; and I believe we need to keep in mind that Japan is one of the largest customers of the United States. She purchases particularly the articles for which we are anxious to find markets. They include wheat, coal, production machinery, aircraft, and cotton.

Japan is to be lauded for her responsiveness in the past to the political storms touched off by heavy imports of low-cost Japanese textiles; for example, she has voluntarily limited some such shipments to the United States. I look forward to an expanding and mutually profitable trade between our two nations, and to the constant strengthening of friendship between our peoples.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Post; an article entitled "A Japan-United States View Swap," published in the Christian Science Monitor; an interesting article entitled "Japan's Climbed High in Decade," from the Washington Post; and an article entitled "Premier Leaves Japan Today for Talks in United States," published in the New York Times of June 19.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1961]

A TIME FOR CANDOR

Washington welcomes a good friend today in Hayato Ikeda, the Premier of Japan. The extreme sensitivity of the issues to be discussed during his visits to the White House and the State Department does not alter the generally good relations between the United States and Japan.

Red China is a subject that for a decade has lain almost beyond the bounds of rational discourse. But Mr. Ikeda's diplomacy can ignore the Communist Chinese no more easily than Britain, over the centuries, has been able to ignore the powers, however hostile, of continental Europe.

Mr. Ikeda is an economist, and he will want to talk about trade. Japan has been very responsive in the past to the political storms touched off by heavy imports of low-cost Japanese textiles, for example, and has voluntarily limited textile shipments here. The chief result of his remarkable act of self-restraint has been, not a diminution of the foreign pressure on American producers, but Japan's loss to her share of this market to other low-cost exporting nations.

When Mr. Ikeda turns to this subject, Americans must keep it in mind that Japan cannot buy where it does not sell. Japan is not only our third biggest customer but also buys products for which we are especially anxious to find markets. These include wheat and coal, production machinery and aircraft, and especially cotton. If we make money selling raw cotton to the Japanese, we can hardly take umbrage if they hope to make money selling finished cotton here.

The military coup in Korea poses rather similar difficulties for Japan and the United States; certainly this will be included in the Ikeda-Kennedy canvass of world troubles. It is fortunate that Mr. Ikeda comes with an unoriental reputation for blunt talk. These are conversations that will require candor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 17, 1961]

A JAPAN-UNITED STATES VIEW SWAP—WHAT TO DO ABOUT PEIPING?

(By Takashi Oka)

HONG KONG.—Policy toward Communist China is likely to be the major topic of Japanese-American conversations when Premier Hayato Ikeda visits Washington next week.

Trade with mainland China and a seat for Peiping at the United Nations are the most urgent aspects of the problem. Mr. Ikeda and his advisers have arrived at no clearcut conclusions regarding either issue, and will go to Washington as much to hear President Kennedy's views on the subject as to express their own.

Japan wants more trade with Peiping. The present level, at $30 million or so one way, is only half the peak attained in 1957.

FORMOSAN TRADE

Japan also would not object to seeing Peiping in the United Nations, if a majority of members favors this. On this issue it parts company with Washington, which actively seeks to prevent this.

But Japan has a profitable trade with Formosa. It would like nothing better than to formulize the two-China policy which in fact it has been conducting for several years. The difficulty is that neither Peiping nor Taipei are willing to go along.

Some Western sources suggest that Japan is the one country which could cut the Gordian knot by boldly recognizing Peiping while still retaining ties with Taipei. This is because Japan recognizes the Nationalists as sovereign only over the territory which they now control or may in the future control—practically speaking, of Formosa and the offshore islands.

PEIPING POSITION

But Peiping would most certainly reject a recognition under such circumstances, while the least Taipei would do probably would be to sever all trade if not diplomatic relations. Recent Japanese visitors to the Chinese Communist capital report their hosts as specifying that future delegations must commit themselves in advance to rejecting the two-China thesis and upholding the people's republic as the only legitimate representative of China.

A group of liberal-democratic parliamentarians will be visiting Peiping at the same time Mr. Ikeda is in Washington. They will be able to test the Chinese Communist attitude toward the Ikeda administration.

Mr. Ikeda's own attitude on a U.N. seat for Peiping is said to be "flexible." Tokyo expects no firm conclusions to emerge from the Premier's talks with President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, though it believes the United States will not command sufficient votes to block debate on the China issue at the U.N. General Assembly this fall. If President Kennedy seeks Japan's cooperation in preventing the seating of Peiping, Mr. Ikeda is expected to make a noncommittal reply. Much can happen between now and the U.N. General Assembly and the Premier does not want to show himself irrevocably hostile toward Peiping unless the Chinese Communists themselves force a break.

ATTITUDE ON SEOUL?

The Japanese Premier will take to Washington a similarly undetermined attitude toward the military junta now ruling in Seoul. The South Korean Army coup of May 16 came just as Japanese-Korean relations seemed to be improving. The new army regime seems less friendly to Japan than did the deposed civilian John W. Chang regime, and Tokyo shares Washington's misgivings about the junta's stability. It is not likely to commit itself for or against the regime for the time being.

As a sop to Japanese nationalists, Mr. Ikeda will ask for American-Japanese cooperation to improve the welfare of Japanese-owned but American-administered Okinawa and Bonin Islands. He is not expected to press for immediate transfer of administrative rights over the islands.

PLEDGE TO INDIA

Mr. Ikeda is an economist who believes in aid to underdeveloped countries. Earlier in the year he sought to promote a "rice bank" scheme under which Japan would buy rice from Southeast Asia surplus countries and sell or loan it to countries in need. The scheme fell through. But the Government is pushing cooperation with Indian, Pakistani, and other development plans and has pledged $80 million toward India's third 5-year plan.

Solution of the post-World War II debt problem, left over, as in West Germany's case, from the days of the American occupation, will promote Japanese-American cooperative aid to underdeveloped Southeast Asian countries. According to a memorandum signed by Foreign Minister Zentaro Kosaka and Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, part of Japan's debt repayments ($490 million spread over 15 years) will be allocated for such aid.

[From the Washington Post]

ECONOMIC EQUAL OF WEST—JAPAN'S CLIMBED HIGH IN DECADE

(By Hessell Tiltman)

TOKYO.—Ten years ago September 8, the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed by 49 nations with only the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia abstaining. By this treaty, which went into effect in April 1952, Japan was freed of Allied occupation and regained its national independence.

At the same time, the original United States-Japan Security Treaty was signed. Its purpose was to insure the security of unarmed Japan and to maintain peace in the Far East.

The official coming of peace altered little in Japan. The occupation had long before become, in Gen. Douglas MacArthur's words, "the friendly guidance of a protective force."

Nevertheless, September 8, 1951, was a memorable date for the nation and its people—just how memorable can be seen in retrospect 10 years later.

In 1951, Japan was confronted with the immense task of restoring political and economic normalcy in a nation in which the population was rapidly expanding. By 1957, what formerly represented normalcy had been left behind. Today, the country is the economic equal of the industrial nations of the West.

Ten years later, the question marks confronting Japan are, economically, whether the Government's target of doubling the national income by 1970 can be attained, and politically, whether the country should remain closely alined with the United States and the West or turn to a policy of neutrality in the cold war between the two major power blocs.

Any such change in basic foreign policy has been firmly rejected by Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, which has a large majority in both Houses of the National Diet, and any drastic change such as the Socialist opposition advocates would, of course, create difficulties for the industrialists who are a major support of the ruling conservatives.

Much the same factors apply in determining how far nationalistic trends in the country are permitted to go. The Japanese are highly race conscious and acutely concerned with exerting their rights. But the nationalism of today is a far cry from the fanatical ultranationalism of prewar times.

Considerably more of the reforms enacted during the occupation era remain in force today than was expected, including the model constitution with its guarantees of individual freedoms and human rights. Japan's big industrialists may not all be overly democratic by Western standards, but they suffered as much as anyone during the militaristic era and shun any revival of the prewar mentality.

The truth would appear to be that, while repudiating any retreat into neutrality, some within the Conservative Party subscribe to the contention of many members of the older generation that the indiscriminate embracing of Western ideas and habits by the younger generation has had some undesirable social results.

In the closing days of the occupation, many Japanese economists and businessmen expressed the view that the artificial orientation of trade toward the United States and away from short-haul Asian sources of raw materials could not last. Now, with Communist China absorbing more of its raw materials at home and Japan's exports to the United States totaling 30 percent of all exports, the Nation has come to realize that any major disturbance in present trading patterns would be economically disastrous.

Japan returned to the world community faced with the necessity of first regaining its former markets and then expanding them. How much has been accomplished is disclosed by a few figures.

From the beginning of the Maiji era to the start of World War II, Japan's economy expanded at an average rate of 4 percent annually. Between 1945 and 1956, it grew at an average rate of 10 to 11 percent each year. In the past 4 years, the index of industrial production has risen from 122.4 to 227.2. In the same 4 years, exports increased from $2.5 billion to $4 billion last year.

Today, despite a population 12 million larger than in 1940, the Japanese people are better fed and better clothed than ever before. Consumption of milk has risen from 3.1 kilograms per person prewar to 19.8 kilograms in 1959. Consumption of meat has increased from 1.8 kilograms per person in 1934–36 to 4.5 kilograms today.

Rice consumption has declined from 131.5 kilograms per person prewar to 114.4 kilograms today while the amount of wheat products consumed has risen from 9.6 kilograms per person prewar to 26 kilograms in 1960.

The national income has expanded in the last 10 years from 5 trillion yen to 11 trillion yen in 1960. In terms of real national income, taking the prewar index as 100, the index rose to 203 in 1959 and an estimated 220 in 1960.

Ahead lie some imponderables. Asian competition may develop into a real threat. The hopes of a large-scale revival of Japan-China trade may not be fully realized. And Japan may have to spend more than the present 1.43 percent of the national income on defense (compared with 12.7 percent in the United States and 8.1 percent in Britain).

But so far and fast has the Japanese economy expanded that there is a shortage of technical skills and skilled labor in some industries and a 10-year plan is being carried out by the Ministry of Education to enroll more students in scientific and technical courses.

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1961]

PREMIER LEAVES JAPAN TODAY FOR TALKS IN UNITED STATES—IKEDA LIKELY TO SET SOFT KEY FOR PARLEY WITH KENNEDY—LEFTWING AND MOSCOW RADIO OPPOSE WASHINGTON VISIT

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

TOKYO, June 18.—Premier Hayato Ikeda will leave by air tomorrow on what is for him a delicate mission to the United States.

The Premier, a 61-year-old politican with a husky frame, a gravelly voice, and a background in finance, is a man whose trademark in office has been playing things soft and easy—the "low posture," the Japanese call it.

This is likely to be reflected in the tone of his talks with President Kennedy on the differences between the United States and Japan. Mr. Ikeda is due in Washington Tuesday.

Mr. Ikeda has been harried by leftwingers who have staged demonstrations to oppose his trip to Washington. He has been denounced by the Moscow radio and he is facing clique sniping in his own conservative-minded Liberal Democratic Party.

NO COMMITMENT SOUGHT

The Premier has made it clear that he is not looking for any commitments from President Kennedy and that he is not eager to give any himself.

A CHANCE TO LISTEN

What he wants to do is to listen to Mr. Kennedy and then to paint a picture of how the Japanese see some of the problems facing both countries—Communist China, trade, Asian military security—differently than the United States does. "Delicately differently," as the Japanese put it these days.

The definition of a "delicate difference" seems to be one that is not sharp enough to create a crisis and about which both sides can talk like gentlemen. But such a difference is nevertheless plain enough to point to the possibility of trouble and the loss of gentlemanliness in the future.

Some Japanese are saying jokingly that the most important part of Mr. Ikeda's visit will come when the photographers snap him shaking hands with Mr. Kennedy at the White House. There is some truth in that remark.

Mr. Ikeda is having some problems at home and his supporters hope that the glamour and publicity of the Washington visit will bolster him. He faces a convention of his party next month, and although his tenure as head of the party will not be voted upon, he is reported to be having some difficulty keeping the party in line.

NO THREAT NOW

There is no direct threat to Mr. Ikeda at the moment. But in Japan Government downfalls are more often a result of shifting alinements among the cliques of the party in power than of policy.

When the talk of the White House gets to Communist China, Mr. Ikeda is expected to tell Mr. Kennedy that many politicians feel the people of Japan lean toward recognition of Peiping, but that the Government has no intention of taking that step now.

The reasons are, first that the Government feels such a move would seriously "disturb" the United States—a country Japan does not want to antagonize—and, second, that Japanese politicians have deep qualms about contributing to Communist China's strength and prestige.

However, judging the carefully foggy official comments so far, the point Mr. Ikeda will try to get across is that Japan regretfully thinks the U.S. policy toward Communist China is too rigid, that the pressures are building up in Tokyo for more "elasticity" on the part of Japan toward Peiping and that while no one in the Government has any affection for Peiping, still, Communist China is a reality.

On the problem of Asian military security, Washington will be most eager to find out from Mr. Ikeda whether the United States can count on full use of its bases in Japan and on her industrial strength in the event of hostilities with the Communists somewhere on the continent.

The answer, as it shapes up here, would probably be: "That depends." The United States would be much more likely to win trouble-free consent to the use of its bases if the Communists attacked again in Korea than if war started in Laos. The Japanese seem to have only a nervously detached interest in Laos.

Trade is also very much on Mr. Ikeda's mind. The announcement a few months ago by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union that it would boycott Japanese textiles caused a scare here. Even though that threat was called off at Washington's request, the fear remains that American industries and unions will continue a campaign against Japanese goods.

THE FEDERAL-STATE WATER CONTROVERSY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] convened 2 days of hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to inquest into the jurisdiction controversy between the Federal Government and State governments respecting water and the right to use water. In my judgment, this constitutes an exceedingly grave problem for the orderly development of water projects all across the Nation, particularly in the semiarid West from which I come.

At the opening of those 2 days of hearings, I made a statement; and I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

FEDERAL-STATE WATER CONTROVERSY

(Opening statement of Senator KUCHEL at hearing, June 15, 1961, before Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, U.S. Senate)

First of all, I express my genuine appreciation and thanks to the able chairman of this committee [Mr. ANDERSON] for calling this highly important hearing today. From my work with him for 2 years on

the Select Committee on National Water Resources and for many more years on the Senate Interior Committee, I realize that he may not share fully my own convictions, and those of some other Senators, that Federal-State jurisdictional conflicts over water rights are an unwarranted deterrent on State and local activity for water-resource development. I believe that the sweeping claims made by the Department of Justice that the Federal Government has overriding paramount rights, and indeed outright ownership, of all of the water rights in all of the unappropriated waters in California and other Western States do, in fact, constitute a "clear and present danger" to State and local progress. In my view, the problem is one of great urgency that Congress must resolve.

The fact that the chairman may not necessarily share these views to the extent that some of us do, makes his scheduling of these hearings the more praiseworthy. I repeat my thanks to him.

As one basis for my strong conviction of the need for congressional action at least to clarify the certainly confused situation with respect to problems in the field of water rights arising from our Federal system, under which both our States and our National Government exercise sovereignty, I would like to cite the findings of the Select Committee on Water Resources. As the members of the committee know, this select committee was established by Senate Resolution 48, 86th Congress. It was composed of 17 Members of the Senate from all sections of the United States—East, West, North, and South.

In the select committee's report, under a sectional heading entitled "Action Areas for Meeting National Goals," there is a subsection called "Clarification of the Federal Position in Connection With Water Rights." I would like to quote a few paragraphs from the select committee's findings on this matter, beginning at page 65 of the report:

"(c) Clarification of the Federal position in connection with water rights: With demand for water far outreaching increases in present sources of supply, conflicts between the States and the Federal Government over the control and use of water are growing sharper and more serious. The problem is a national one, but its threat is especially grave in the public land States of the semiarid West, where not only is water even more scarce than elsewhere in our country but where Federal ownership of millions upon millions of acres of land give the Federal Government an asserted basis for claiming proprietorship, paramount rights, or title in fee simple absolute to all unappropriated waters in many of our States.

"Inevitably, such sweeping claims by the Federal Government might retard State plans and projects for development of their own water resources to meet local needs and conditions for their own citizens in accordance with their own local law and custom. As a result, all of our people everywhere are the losers.

"A few specific examples will serve to illustrate the danger. California, with its nearly 16 million citizens—to whom a half million more are being added each year—has a far-reaching State water resource development plan, estimated to cost $11 or more billions of dollars within the next 25 years. Last November the voters of the State adopted a proposal to bond themselves in the amount of $1,750 million to bring the waters of the Feather River from the northern to the southern part of the State over a transmission system hundreds of miles long.

"At the very time this project was under consideration by the people of the State, the Federal Government asserted in a California court action that when the United States acquired the area that is now California, and five other States, under the 1848 peace treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which ended the war with Mexico, the Federal Government became the owner of all lands and all rights to use water within the area. This ownership is still retained unless it has been divested pursuant to act of Congress. There has been no such divestment (*City of Fesno* v. *State Water Rights Board*, California Superior Court, Fresno County, No. 105245).

"This claim by the Federal Government, based on a 112-year-old peace treaty, of outright ownership over all unappropriated water in the State, is described by California officials as casting a dark and ugly cloud over California's water development program. If this situation is to deter the development of California water resources or the development of the resources of any other State, this conflict must be cleared up and the Congress should take leadership in doing it.

"Examples of the conflicts of Federal-State jurisdiction in the field of water abound. One arose in Iowa where a State law sought to prevent diversion of water from one river to another within the State but where a private utility, licensed by a Federal agency, contended it did not need to comply with the State law. The Supreme Court agreed with the utility's contention. The Hawthorne case in Nevada represents a controversy between the Navy, occupying property in that State, and the State of Nevada over the applicability of a State law controlling underground water to a Federal military reservation. We make no comment on the validity of the Federal and State contentions. We point to them simply to indicate our belief that what can be done to compose the conflicts in this field ought to be done by both the Federal Government and by the several States.

"These cases mentioned briefly above are but a few specific examples of the ever-increasing conflict between the Federal Government and the States over water rights. As stated, such conflicts operate to the disadvantage of both, retarding the maximum development of water resources by the States."

And here, I am glad to say, the chairman and I reached complete agreement in supporting the findings I have just read.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this is the finding by the Select Committee on National Water Resources, on which I had the honor to serve as vice chairman under the chairmanship of the very able Senator from Oklahoma, BOB KERR. It may be recalled that sometime prior to the writing of this report, I had occasion to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to this threatening situation. On May 26, 1960, I made what was for me rather a lengthy speech in the Senate, pointing out the then proposed report of the Supreme Court's special master in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* would deny the 16 million citizens of California their long recognized rights in the waters of the Colorado River, and also pointing out the grave implications of the sweeeping claim asserted by the Department of Justice in the Fresno case to outright ownership by the Federal Government of all rights to all unappropriated water in California.

Because of its pertinency to the subject matter of this hearing, Mr. Chairman, I request that the text of this speech be printed as an appendix to this hearing.

I regret to report to this committee that the fears I expressed in that speech have been justified once again. Only last month, in May 1961, the Department of Justice filed a brief in the Supreme Court of the United States in support of the exceptions the Federal Government is taking to the special master's report in the *Arizona* v. *California* case. The master had found, and had recommended in his proposed decree, that water rights within a State under contracts entered into pursuant to the Boulder Canyon Project Act would be subject to the laws of the State. That is, in the words of the special master: "* * * State law governs intrastate rights and priorities to water diverted from the Colorado River." This finding is from pages 216 and 303 of the master's report.

But the Department of Justice has vigorously objected to such a finding and has urged that it be purged from the report and recommended decree. The Justice Department on page 32 of its brief asserts, as a general rule, the claim that "the rights of landowners to receive and use the waters developed by a Federal reclamation project have been derived under and determined by contracts made with the United States in pursuance of applicable Federal law." Again, on page 43 of its brief, the Justice Department asserts: "The power of the Secretary to determine, without threat of veto by State authorities, the quantities and priorities of the water to be delivered is essential to efficient and effective operation intrastate as his power to select the persons to whom the water will be supplied."

Under this doctrine advocated by the Department of Justice, namely, that even the apportionment, priority, and use of an individual State's share of the waters of an interstate stream are governed by Federal law, not State law, what becomes of our historic American concept of local self-government?

I submit, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, that such a doctrine does indeed cast what I have referred to previously as a "dark and ugly cloud" over the rights of a State in waters within its State boundaries. Inevitably, such a position by our National Government is a deterrent to action by a State to develop its water resources.

At our meeting earlier this year with the National Reclamation Association, considerable time and attention was devoted to a discussion of State and Federal water rights. The chairman, referring to a letter written him by the then Solicitor General of the United States, J. Lee Rankin, on a proposed section in the select committee's report, asked for specific examples of instances in which the Federal Government had stepped in and taken away water rights without just compensation. This was a proper question for the chairman to ask.

But I respectfully submit that the issue we have before us so urgently today is much broader than that posed by the chairman's question. The 16 million American citizens of my own State of California voted last November to burden themselves with a debt that might total $1,750 million for water resource development. But with the Justice Department asserting, as in the Fresno case, that the Federal Government owns all rights to unappropriated waters within the State, and claiming, as in its brief in the Arizona case, that Federal law controls the apportionment and use of California's share of the waters of the Colorado, there necessarily and inevitably must be some uncertainty, to say the least, as to just what steps my State safely may take in the development of our water resources, even within our borders and at our own expense.

I come from a State which is eternally grateful for the prodigious assistance the Federal Government has given us. Hoover Dam and the Central Valleys project are prime examples. My concern is simply to remove roadblocks from maximum cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States. As I said last March in a talk I made to the California Municipal Utilities Association meeting in San Francisco:

"We are at the beginning of an era, I hope and believe, of genuine cooperation, both legally and physically, between the Federal Government and our State and local governments for the maximum development

and use of our water resources in accordance with State and local needs and customs, and the desires of the people of California. At the same time, the Federal function and responsibility will be carried forward far more effectively.

"This new approach will be, I hope and believe, one of greater recognition and greater respect by the Federal Government for the historic principle of local autonomy and self-government under which our Nation has grown great. At the same time, the State will recognize the responsibilities of the Federal Government under our constitutional system and have due respect for and appreciation of its role in water resource development."

I want to reiterate that hope and belief here and now.

THE NEED FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this Congress will be false to the future of the Nation if it fails to discharge a bipartisan promise to the American people to give assistance to the education of our youth.

Of 36 million public elementary and secondary school pupils, an estimated 8 million are in overcrowded classrooms. Two million more go to school in obsolete buildings. Upward of 700,000 of our children attend half-day schools, an ugly fact when contrasted with the advances in education attained by the Soviet, to mention one.

The so-called impacted school district law expires on June 30, 1961. California, with a heavy incidence of defense installations, cannot afford to pick up the check for the education of thousands of children, the parents of whom, civilian and military, pay no State or local taxes, for the most part, in support of our State school system.

The Senate has faced up to this problem. It has passed a bill dealing with these grave questions. In the main, it is a constructive piece of legislation. It is now the responsibility of the House of Representatives to act on this matter.

On this subject, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I recently sent a constituent be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your recent letters to the Los Angeles Times and to me in which you condemn my vote for a 3-year program for Federal aid to education. The essence of your charges are:

1. That by voting for a national program under which California will receive approximately $46 million per year over the 3-year period while paying in over $60 million I have voted for spending $14 million worth of "California" money in other States, and

2. That I have not followed Lincoln's criterion for Federal action that "The Government only should do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves."

The Federal aid to education measure which I supported consisted of two basic programs: One, a new 3-year program of general assistance to precollege education; the other, a continuation for 3 years of the so-called federally impacted area legislation. This latter program has been in effect for over a decade. During this period California has received almost $340 million of Federal assistance to aid in the construction, operation, and maintenance of its public school system in those areas where children of military and civilian personnel on defense installations are located. I have hundreds of letters from school board members, principals, schoolteachers, and taxpayers generally indicating that without this program it would have been impossible to meet the educational challenge posed by the great influx of this defense-related population. Without this Federal assistance, the local property holder, in many parts of California, would have been compelled to asume an inequitable and intolerable local property tax burden. For fiscal year 1960, almost $31 million was granted 496 school districts under this program. For those who believe in naive accounting, that amount alone should more than take care of the alleged $14 million deficit with which I am charged.

But secondly, and more important, such naive accounting shows little faith in the future of our Nation and little understanding of our past heritage. I am sure that the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, would have decried such an attempt to pit one State or even a group of States against the rest of America. He would have been correct philosophically and, if he had had the figures, even more correct economically.

While no accurate summary can be made of the Federal funds which flow in and out of California, I point to some obvious facts. In fiscal year 1960, California residents and corporations paid almost $8 billion in Federal taxes. In that same year, the U.S. Government awarded 23.7 percent of the defense construction and procurement of our Military Establishment to California firms. This totaled almost $4.9 billion. In addition $1.5 billion was expended during that period on military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are located in our State. In fiscal year 1960, approximately $678 million in Federal funds were granted to our State and local Governments and private individuals and institutions for diverse Federal programs such as agricultural experiment stations, highways, public assistance, airports, needy children, unemployment compensation, and heart and cancer research, university, and individual scientific research among others. Besides these expenditures, I have not included the cost of vast Federal programs such as the postal service or the money spent on water development. Our State has more Federal employees than our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C.

In the field of water resource development, the Federal Government has been of untold help in attempting to contain, store, and put to effective use our State's most valuable resource—its water. Since becoming a Senator in 1953, I have been especially concerned with assuring an appropriate Federal contribution to the water development which is so badly needed if our industry, people, and economy are to continue to flourish. I am proud to have played a role in securing the authorization of such great developments as the Trinity ($300 million) and San Luis ($300 million) projects among others. At the end of this month, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I serve will consider authorizing the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal projects ($225 million). So much for the accounting.

Now to the policy. Federal aid to education legislation does not undermine local control; it does not abolish local school boards; it does not mean the dictation of what should be taught in our schools. This is something for the local residents and their elected representatives on the school board and in the State senate and State assembly to decide, and rightly so.

My late colleague, Senator Robert A. Taft, was the author of the approach which I preferred in the field of Federal aid to education. However, when one is a member of the minority party, one cannot always precisely obtain what one prefers. Earlier in this session, I coauthored a bill which was based on the Taft approach. That proposal would have provided a minimum foundation grant of $20 per public school child and then an equalization grant for those States, some 18 in all, where the level of precollege education is drastically in arrears compared with the rest of the Nation. This is the same approach we use in our own State. Many of our so-called "poorer" counties do not have the industrial base of a county such as Los Angeles and thus the property taxes they impose do not generate the full revenue which is needed to educate our youth adequately. Thus the richer counties in California provide some equalization funds to aid the poorer ones.

For the sake of our own State and Nation is there a need for any Federal action in this area? I think so. So does the Republican National Platform. At home and abroad we are faced with a challenge whose outcome will depend on the full utilization of the best talent and manpower our Nation can offer. In this, we know no State lines. This is a critical national problem. California is considered to be a leader in the field of public education. Yet at the beginning of this school year, California still had 93,952 students on half-day sessions in its elementary and high schools. California is a leader; yet in 1959 according to the Surgeon General of the Army, our State ranked 28th among the 50 States when 20.6 percent of the selective service registrants failed the mental test. In Iowa, only 5.6 failed, while in Louisiana, 50 percent, in Mississippi, 53.4 percent, and in South Carolina, 61.9 percent failed. Our Nation cannot afford such a loss in manpower because of inadequate educational opportunities.

In 1960, there were approximately 16 million Californians. This was 5 million more than in 1950. It is conservatively estimated that at the end of the coming decade there will be 22 million residents of our State. As we both know, they are not all born here. Rather, a great many move to California because of the economic opportunities which we offer. The mobility of our industrial society and the needs of our national defense have truly made us one nation and we cannot afford ill-educated men and women in any part of our land.

A study completed last year by the U.S. Department of Labor concluded that the kinds of jobs industry will need workers for are changing and that "the biggest increases will occur in occupations requiring the most education and training." For example, it is predicted that there will be a 40-percent increase of those in the professional and technical occupations, almost a 25-percent increase in proprietors and managers, the same for skilled workers, and even more for those in the clerical and sales category. There will be little change in the number of unskilled workers and a drastic reduction of farmworkers. In this decade, 29 million Americans will enter our labor force. If they are to be able to meet the requirements of an increasingly complex industrial economy, if they are to be able to earn a living in tomorrow's world, and if they are to do their part to further democracy and stop communism, then they will have to be properly educated.

During this decade our Nation's elementary and secondary school enrollment will increase 8.1 million over what it was during the 1950's. No letup in the annual increase of over 1.1 million will occur until after 1965. The bill which the Senate recently passed will expire in 1964.

It has been charged that by voting for a Federal aid to education bill, rich States

are giving away money to the poor States and the latter are not making any effort to solve their own problems. I think the best way to find out where the truth lies with this charge is to look at what the 18 States who would get the most money per school age pupil under the bill have done to put their own house in order.

Under the legislation which the Senate adopted, California will receive $12.45 per school age pupil. The 18 States which I have mentioned include Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. The amounts per pupil they would receive range from $22.50 for Oklahoma to $27.79 for Arkansas and Mississippi. Have they tried to help solve their own problems in the last decade? They have. In terms of the total expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance, comparing the figures in constant prices to eliminate the inflation factor, California spent 16.4 percent more in 1959–60 than it did in 1949–50 per public school pupil. The group of 18 States I have mentioned ranged from an unusual low of a 1.3-percent increase by Idaho to a median increase of 17.5 percent for South Carolina, and great increases by Virginia (29.5 percent), Kentucky (30.2 percent), Utah (32 percent), and Mississippi (127 percent).

Another index of effort is the amount of taxes collected by State and local government per $100 of personal income. In 1959, the national average was $8.49 per $100. Our own State had a rate of $9.50 per $100. Of this group of 18 States, most of them inhabited by people of lower incomes than our own, 10 of them were above the national average of $8.49 and one-third had higher tax levies than California. Some of the tax levies which were higher than California included Mississippi ($10.57), Louisiana ($11.24), Vermont ($11.31), North Dakota ($12.01), and South Dakota ($12.28). Obviously for those States which are taxing below the national average more effort should be made. But I think it is clear that the majority of the States who would be aided have tried, and, having tried, have not been able to keep pace with the ability of the larger, urbanized States with a greater industrial base, in meeting their school needs.

In summary, there is a Federal responsibility to do part of the job to bridge the educational gap which exists in our Nation. President Eisenhower and the last Republican administration recommended Federal aid to education. The Republican Party, in 1960, in our platform unanimously endorsed this principle. Vice President Nixon campaigned on it. Now is the time for action. And I think Lincoln, under whom the great Land Grant College Act was enacted, would agree.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF 4 PERCENT CREDIT FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED FROM DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 1 year ago today, the Senate, by a margin of 1 vote, approved an amendment to repeal the 4 percent credit for dividends received from domestic corporations. The vote was 42 for repeal, 41 against repeal, and 17 absent and not voting. I call the roll on that dismal, hypocritical occasion:

Yeas, 42: Anderson, Bartlett, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Carroll, Case of South Dakota, Church, Clark, Cooper, Dodd, Douglas, Engle, Ervin, Frear, Fulbright, Gore, Gruening, Hart, Hill, Jackson, Johnson of Texas, Lausche, Long of Hawaii, Long of Louisiana, Lusk, McCarthy, McGee, Mansfield, Monroney, Morse, Moss, Muskie, O'Mahoney, Pastore, Proxmire, Symington, Talmadge, Wiley, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young of Ohio.

Nays, 41: Aiken, Allott, Bennett, Brunsdale, Bush, Butler, Byrd of Virginia, Capehart, Carlson, Case of New Jersey, Chavez, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dworshak, Ellender, Fong, Hickenlooper, Holland, Hruska, Javits, Johnston of South Carolina, Jordan, Keating, Kuchel, McClellan, Martin, Morton, Mundt, Prouty, Randolph, Robertson, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Scott, Smathers, Smith, Stennis, Thurmond, Williams of Delaware, Young of North Dakota.

Not voting, 17: Beall, Bridges, Eastland, Goldwater, Green, Hartke, Hayden, Hennings, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kennedy, Kerr, McNamara, Magnuson, Murray, Russell, Sparkman.

That regrettable rollcall, on that regrettable occasion, convicted the Senate in my judgment, of favoring double taxation. It was an ill-considered and contemptuous assault on the investment in American business by the ordinary citizen. It went the "soak-the-rich" advocates one better: it proposed to soak anybody, big or little, whose faith in the Nation prompted him to buy stock in American corporate business. It was, therefore, an assault upon our system of free, competitive enterprise. Our people are grateful to the House conferees who steadfastly refused to go along.

Now comes the administration, urging that this Congress vote the selfsame repealer which the last Congress refused to do. I speak today briefly, Mr. President, to urge the Senate, particularly the new Senators and those who were absent from last year's rollcall, to weigh carefully the retrogressive effects of the administration's position, and to oppose it when again we confront it on this floor.

The President has sent the Congress a number of proposals for change in our tax laws. With some of them, I am in agreement. But I propose today to take vigorous exception to wiping out the woefully small relief presently available against two income tax "bites" into the same dollar of profit. I oppose, too, his request for withholding on income of this type.

In 1954, at the request of the Eisenhower administration, the Congress amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide with respect to dividends, from domestic corporations, first, an exclusion of the first $50 of dividend income, and second, a 4-percent tax credit on the balance.

This action was taken from a variety of compelling reasons. There can be no moral or equitable justification in having the Federal Government take two income tax bites out of the same dollar of profit; the tax credit provided is some slight relief from double taxation, far less than that afforded under the tax laws of other nations in the free world. Far more will be gained from interesting our people in security holdings by giving them some incentive to invest in American business.

Senators know that an American corporation, with some slight exceptions not relevant here, pay 52 cents out of every dollar of profit to the Federal Government under the revenue laws. If any or all of the remaining 48 cents is distributed to the owners, that is, the stockholders, a second income tax is levied on what is distributed, again under Federal revenue laws. Thus, the stockholder is taxed from 20 percent up, on the same profit dollar from which 52 cents has already been taken. Thus, even at the lowest income levels, the effective tax rate for the individual stockholder is 62 percent, and up—three times the rate the lowest-bracket taxpayer would otherwise be called upon to pay. If the business were not a corporation, the 52-percent tax bite would not, of course, apply. If the business were a partnership, if the stockholders were partners, the Federal revenue laws would provide—as they should provide—for one tax bite only on each dollar of profit.

A very large percentage of today's shareholders are persons of modest income. According to the New York Stock Exchange Census of 1959, there were 12.5 million shareholders in 1959. About 3.5 million of these had annual family incomes under $5,000. Another 6 million shareholders had incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. This means that families with incomes of $10,000 or less accounted for about 60 percent of the dividends on 1958 income tax returns. Furthermore, the exclusion alone relieved about 3 million taxpayers—one-fourth of all shareholders—from the entire double tax burden. Contrariwise, the President contended that the credit and exclusion gave either insufficient or no relief to shareholders with smaller incomes. I deny it, and point to the foregoing facts.

It may be worth while to bear in mind that the exclusion and credit give relative or proportional relief to all shareholders. Obviously, the more dividend income, the greater relief against two Federal bites. But those in this category carry the greatest burden of the dividend tax in absolute dollars. We cannot slight the fact that stockholder investment is essential to the very commencement of any corporate enterprise. Without stockholders to provide some or all of the capital, the corporation could not commence business or provide employment opportunities other than by borrowing. And the smaller and more speculative the enterprise, the more necessary is stockholder investment.

Tax treatment of dividends, thus, can either discourage or encourage broadening the base of equity financing. The 1954 provisions have accomplished one of its goals—an increase in individual investment. Stockholders today number over 15 million, more than double the number in mid-1954. While many factors have gone into this remarkable growth, the dividend exclusion and credit have certainly played an important part.

At this particular time, there can be no doubt as to the urgency of speeding up our annual rate of growth. In the

light of this, how can we even contemplate a measure—this proposed repealer—which is inconsistent with the attempt to encourage a climate favorable to capital investment?

With the encouragement of our economic health in mind, we could, I think, learn from the examples of other countries, most of which afford special treatment to dividend income.

In 1949, the Canadian Parliament adopted a 10-percent tax credit for dividends. Official evaluation of this step toward greater equity and increased investment was so favorable that the Dominion Government, in 1954, subsequently increased the tax credit for dividends from 10 percent to 20 percent.

Great Britain treats corporate and individual tax identically with that part of the tax paid by the corporation credited to the individual. The result is an elimination of double taxation, and an impetus to investment in England.

And the tax policies of Canada and Great Britain are not merely isolated, successful cases. Many other governments afford special treatment to dividend income, ostensibly to eliminate or alleviate penalizing the investor, and thereby encouraging investment and growth.

Some countries levy no tax whatsoever on dividends received by individuals. This is the practice in Costa Rica, Finland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Venezuela, New Zealand, and Nicaragua, among others.

Other countries, such as Argentina, Israel, and Japan, give credit on personal income tax for dividends received by individuals or corporate income taxes paid by the companies declaring these dividends.

Still other countries, Belgium and Germany among them, tax distributed profits at a lower rate than undistributed profits or exclude them from the corporate tax base.

Among those nations treating dividends more leniently than the United States are several of the fastest growing nations in the world—in economic terms, not population. While the forces responsible for economic growth are diverse and complex, nevertheless, we must acknowledge that among the primary determinates are the level and expansion of investment.

If we attempt to restrict that investment by allowing the President's proposal to materialize, we may well be reducing the level of private funds available for financing our own economic expansion. If such were the case, debt financing would become more favorable. I need not go into depth for this body when I say that debt financing is an undesirable development. It tends to decrease the financial flexibility of business. It makes our free system more vulnerable in periods of depressed economic activity.

There may be even a more serious implication to this course of action. Equity capital is most important to small business. The big corporations can get by. What is the point of putting all the small business relief provisions into our tax law, if, at the same time, we initiate actions which will make it substantially more difficult for the small businessman to attract needed capital?

Finally, on the subject of the dividend allowances, no discussion of any tax law is complete without a discussion of the revenue yield. The administration anticipates a revenue gain of $450 million per year, if the repealer is approved. True, there may be more revenue for the Government in the short run, but the long-run repercussions may well result in decreased revenue to the Government. The 1954 law did not reduce tax revenues. By broadening the investment base, revenues from dividends have actually increased by about $200 million annually ever since.

WITHHOLDING

In order to obtain full payment of taxes, the Treasury Department has proposed a system of an across-the-board withholding of 20 percent on dividend and interest income. Of course, everyone is in accord with the objectives of the Treasury to obtain full payment of all taxes legally due and owing. Taxable dividend and interest income must be fully reported on Federal income tax returns. Nevertheless, in this instance, I can think of no more cumbersome method than the withholding procedure.

As indicated by the statistics on stockholders, the number of small investors is so great as to make the effort perhaps more costly than the realization of unreported taxes. Career people in the Internal Revenue Service have told me this is their view.

Permit me to expand on this point. Anticipating the consideration of mandatory withholding, the American Bankers' Association took a sample survey of 300 commercial banks.

The most revealing finding obtained from the survey—

According to testimony in behalf of the ABA before the House Ways and Means Committee—

is the very large concentration of small savings accounts.

It is significant to note that two-thirds of the savings accounts in the reporting banks pay less than $15 in annual interest. Another 15 percent pay annual interest between $15 and $45. Only one-half of 1 percent of the accounts received interest in excess of $600.

If we project this representative sample to the 52 million savings accounts nationwide, approximately 34 million savings accounts in commercial banks earn interest amounting to less than $15 a year. One need not be too imaginative to deduce the amount of unnecessary bookkeeping as a result of the multitudes of small accounts.

The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, representing 515 mutual savings banks, reached a similar conclusion:

The great majority of regular accounts in mutual savings banks have small balances.

The prevalence of the small depositor can be still further verified by figures sent to me, at my request, from the Bank of America. Almost 4 million depositors with the Bank of America have accounts under $500, and 3¼ million of these have accounts under $100.

Another factor to be considered in connection with the proposed withholding is refunding. Without a doubt, refunds under such an arrangement would reach phenomenal proportions—and phenomenal costs.

By 1962, there will be an estimated 11 million accounts held by individuals 65 years of age or older; a large percentage of these would be eligible for refunds. Another 5½ million accounts will be held by individuals under the age of 20, most of whom would also be entitled to refunds. Finally, there are the many depositors who, in any event, would be entitled to refunds, because the effective tax rate on their income will be less than 20 percent.

With all these factors, it should be obvious that no practical withholding system can possibly be achieved. It is complicated still further by another Treasury proposal. Under this proposal, provision is made for a quarterly refund of withheld tax of $10 or more on dividends and interest received during the previous 3 months.

Banks and corporations, already burdened with Government paperwork, would become the tax collectors of America. It would be particularly onerous to all savings institutions. Not only affected under the proposed system by the withholding of interest and dividends paid to their own stockholders and depositors, they would also be encumbered by the withholding of the dividends of many organizations for whom they act as paying agents.

There surely must be a more reasonable solution to curbing tax evasion or avoidance. It should be reasonable to assume that the Government itself could undertake the responsibility of seeing to it that there is more complete reporting of interest and dividends. Over the next few years, it should be possible for the Internal Revenue Service, by means of electronic data processing, to make more effective use of information to prevent underreporting or failures to report. This, also, is the opinion of career people in the Internal Revenue Service.

The acceptance of either recommendation—the discontinuance of the tax credit on dividends and the establishment of a withholding system for dividends and interest income—carries with it the elements of inequality and unsound economics. Such an approach would hamstring American banking and industry. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I would be happy to aid the Internal Revenue Service in any way that I can by approving legislation enabling them to employ additional qualified agents to uncover those who are failing to report dividend and interest income.

The average individual, by savings and investment, is endeavoring to help himself and his family prepare for the future and to assure greater independence in the years of retirement. In so doing, he is adding to the economic strength of the Nation. Thus, for the sake of our citizenry and of our system of free, competitive enterprise, we can-

not afford to penalize efforts of self-help by the people of the country.

Withholding taxes on dividends and interest only complicates the issue. Aside from the staggering amounts of auditing required, such a proposal siphons off from the investment stream moneys otherwise available for investment and expansion.

We grew to greatness as a Nation by putting our private capital to work. Why now discourage this when the challenges of the day demand still greater strength from the Nation and from the system of free enterprise? The Senate, in my opinion, ought to reject both these proposals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HRUSKA addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I call up an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 19, after the word "to," strike $250,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think we should all know precisely what the amendment would do and what it would not do. The amendment proposes to reduce the so-called agricultural conservation program advanced authorization for the calendar year 1952, from $250 million as stated in the bill before us to $150 million and hence to make a saving of $100 million.

The agricultural conservation program to which my amendment relates is not the soil conservation program. It is sometimes called a part of the soil conservation program, but it is very important we realize it really has almost nothing to do with soil conservation.

The Soil Conservation Service does a very excellent job in spreading knowledge of, and assisting in the practice of, conservation operations such as contour plowing, terracing, prevention of wind and water erosion, prevention of floods, and the new program to conserve the Great Plains.

In the bill under consideration approximately $176 million is to be provided for the Soil Conservation Service. This amendment would not touch a single cent of that amount. What this amendment would do is require the reduction of ACP expenditures for limestone, phosphate, and other chemicals; for the draining of marshland; and for certain irrigation programs.

In the budget which President Eisenhower submitted on the 16th of January he requested an ACP advance authorization of $100 million for the program for calendar year 1962. When President Kennedy reviewed the Eisenhower budget he raised President Eisenhower's request by $50 million, to $150 million. However, the House Appropriations Committee raised that by $100 million more, to a total of $250 million.

There was a very lively debate on the floor of the House on this matter, but the advance authorization of $250 million was finally upheld on a rollcall vote by 184 to 196. Those who wish to consult the debate will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6 at pages 9620 to 9628.

According to my rough estimates based on actual ACP assistance expenditures for 1959, the latest year for which data is available, of the $100 million by which the amendment seeks to reduce the ACP authorization, approximately $73 million would be spent for lime, phosphate, and other commercial fertilizers to be placed on the soil. These chemicals would increase the yield of land in the first year and they would have similar effect, to some degree, in the second year. These are not permanent soil-conserving or soil-enhancing expenditures.

The application of lime, phosphate, and other chemicals is designed to increase current yields. At a time when American taxpayers are being asked to spend several billions of dollars to reduce acreage, and therefore to reduce production of farm goods, it is extraordinary that we now propose to spend $73 million to increase production of farm products. Such a proposal raises the question of how foolish we can be. How can we, on the one hand, seek to reduce production of farm products in order to eliminate the surplus and raise income—and I believe farm income will be raised if output is reduced because of the inelastic demand for farm products—and at the same time expend $73 million for lime, phosphate, nitrogen, and other chemicals designed to increase yields per acre? Such proposals are beyond my understanding.

I realize that the program is well established. I realize that since 1936 more than 406 million tons of liming materials have been put on the land of this country under the ACP program. A very powerful limestone lobby has been built up, a lobby which is always present when appropriation bills are considered, and which always seeks a large appropriation. Lobbies in other branches of the fertilizer industry are extremely busy. In fact, the bill is more properly one to help the fertilizer lobby than it is to help the farmer. Its whole purpose is contradictory to the purpose of reducing production of farm products.

ACP expenditures for 1959 also indicate that the $250 million authorization would result in expenditures of some $16 million for drainage of excess water from the marshlands of the country. Such drainage will have the ultimate effect of increasing the acreage available for the raising of farm products at a time when, presumably, we are trying to decrease the acreage elsewhere. Such expenditures would diminish the area of marshlands which now give shelter to ducks and geese, of which there is a shortage. So we would spend $16 million to diminish the hunting opportunities of those who like to shoot geese and ducks at the same time the Department of the Interior is being given added funds with which to flood lands and create more shooting facilities.

The program is contradictory, not merely from the standpoint of encouraging land productivity in the face of other programs to reduce surpluses, but also with respect to the removal of so-called excess water, which results in the bringing into crop production of more lands and in the destruction of badly needed wildlife havens currently being artificially created under other Government programs.

Additionally, the $250 million authorization would provide some $11 million for the reorganization of irrigation systems and the leveling of irrigation land. Such programs are also in large part contradictory, for reasons similar to those already stated.

Mr. President, if we are really for economy, I believe I have shown one of the first places where we should begin. Last week we provided a subsidy of $165 million a year, or $1,800 million over the course of 11 years, to the large trucking companies and the truck lobby. Today we would continue a subsidy of $73 million a year to the fertilizer lobby.

I believe that we should return to the recommendations of the President of the United States. Sometimes the President is criticized by Senators on the other side of the aisle, and sometimes by Senators on this side of the aisle, for desiring to spend too much money. As Senators know, I am for the welfare programs of the President. But I have pointed out a case in which the Congress is trying forcibly to stuff the President's budget with an added $100 million, which he did not request, which fulfills no defensible purpose, and which I hope will be eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not agree with all the conclusions stated by the Senator from Illinois, but I commend him for attacking a program in which he does not believe, but which is very generally utilized in his own State. He is entitled to great credit for courage on that score.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly well aware of the fact that Illinois would receive more than $5½ million. An attaché of the committee came to me prior to this time and said, "I understand you are going to try to cut off money from your own State."

I defend the interest of my State, but I put the interests of the taxpayers of the United States first.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not responsible for any statements made by any attachés of the committee. I have made my statement. I did not direct or suggest that any attaché of the committee approach the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I had no knowledge of it. Had I thought it would be done, I would have interposed a very vigorous objection, because I know how the Senator from Illinois resents approaches of that kind.

The Senator is being consistent. Many times persons oppose programs that would not benefit their own States. It would be easy for a man in my part of the country to oppose irrigation projects in areas where such projects are proposed. Another would vigorously oppose flood control programs in other sections of the country. I do not agree with the Senator's conclusion. In my opinion, the proposed program is one of the most valuable programs affecting agriculture that has been in existence in this country over a long period of years.

I do not know where the Senator obtained his figure of $73 million for fertilizer. I am sure that he got it from some authoritative source. The figures I have been able to obtain indicate that for liming, 16 percent was spent throughout the entire country, but in the State of Illinois the percentage is 41 percent.

On page 446 of the Senate hearings appears a graph or chart which shows the way in which liming is used. If Senators will turn to that graph, they will see that in the Great Lakes area liming is the primary program that is utilized. In my part of the country liming is not such a popular practice. People practice terracing, the planting of cover crops, the planting of forests, and other things of that nature.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator said that he did not know where I obtained my figure of $73 million for liming and fertilizing. I refer him to the volume entitled "The Agriculture Conservation Program: Statistical Summary, 1959," table 20, page 95, which shows that the total for liming in 1959 was $37,993,015, and that commercial fertilizers amounted to $34,821,132, making a combined total of $72,814,147.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, this table, titled "Amount and cost-share per ton of liming materials, and total assistance for liming materials and commercial fertilizers, agricultural conservation program, by States, 1959."

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

TABLE 20.—*Amount and cost-share per ton of liming materials, and total assistance for liming materials and commercial fertilizers, agricultural conservation program, by States, 1959*

REGULAR ACP

State	Liming materials [1]				Assistance for commercial fertilizers [2]		Assistance for all minerals [3]	
	Amount [4]	Cost-share per ton	Assistance					
			Total [5]	Portion of State total	Total	Portion of State total	Total	Portion of State total
	Tons	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Percent*
Alabama	240,420	3.28	787,684	13.30	2,351,702	39.71	3,139,386	53.01
Alaska					6,010	10.18	6,010	10.18
Arizona								
Arkansas	346,038	2.94	1,018,369	21.63	650,605	13.81	1,668,974	35.44
California	4,955	2.38	11,784	.23	73,336	1.45	85,120	1.68
Colorado					25,755	.86	25,755	.86
Connecticut	15,024	4.39	65,940	15.78	182,874	43.77	248,814	59.55
Delaware	45,448	4.07	185,110	56.95	15,555	4.79	200,665	61.74
Florida	174,866	3.97	694,028	25.50	914,255	33.60	1,608,283	59.10
Georgia	278,008	4.36	1,213,044	16.58	3,061,973	41.85	4,275,017	58.43
Hawaii	264	14.02	3,700	2.10	19,312	10.96	23,012	13.06
Idaho					16,454	.98	16,454	.98
Illinois	1,925,065	1.59	3,055,407	42.26	2,601,218	35.98	5,656,625	78.24
Indiana	1,440,650	1.68	2,424,719	45.33	141,492	2.64	2,566,211	47.97
Iowa	756,717	1.58	1,193,505	21.83	70,188	1.28	1,263,693	23.11
Kansas	270,136	2.34	632,277	10.19	202,429	3.27	834,706	13.46
Kentucky	832,179	1.76	1,462,026	21.54	1,750,141	25.78	3,212,167	47.32
Louisiana	153,014	5.18	792,935	18.92	930,287	22.19	1,723,222	41.11
Maine	62,156	6.99	434,432	47.27	334,839	36.43	769,271	83.70
Maryland	172,770	3.69	636,910	50.47	171,401	13.58	808,311	64.05
Massachusetts	59,179	5.38	318,556	59.56	98,261	18.37	416,817	77.93
Michigan	317,342	2.94	933,743	25.29	323,244	8.76	1,256,987	34.05
Minnesota	483,918	2.00	969,227	18.12	453,839	8.48	1,423,066	26.60
Mississippi	283,053	3.87	1,096,396	17.00	2,407,002	37.33	3,503,398	54.33
Missouri	1,604,964	2.00	3,204,446	34.05	2,743,829	29.16	5,948,275	63.21
Montana					10,092	.35	10,092	.35
Nebraska	70,153	2.17	152,155	3.04	36,414	.73	188,569	3.77
Nevada					8,230	2.34	8,230	2.34
New Hampshire	22,146	5.71	126,505	24.54	211,399	41.02	337,904	65.56
New Jersey	33,559	4.36	146,440	22.01	77,407	11.64	223,847	33.65
New Mexico					4,018	.21	4,018	.21
New York	660,724	4.28	2,825 914	61.72	464,954	10.16	3,290,868	71.88
North Carolina	380,936	4.41	1,679,197	27.45	1,778,849	29.09	3,458,046	56.54
North Dakota								
Ohio	1,136,658	2.35	2,667,473	48.47	169,019	3.07	2,836,492	51.54
Oklahoma	100,251	3.31	332,192	4.97	845,382	12.65	1,177,574	17.62
Oregon	42,092	6.46	272,113	12.49	71,421	3.28	343,534	15.77
Pennsylvania	591,796	3.84	2,270,554	46.74	1,307,730	26.92	3,578,284	73.66
Puerto Rico	188	4.00	752	.09	536,680	63.43	537,432	63.52
Rhode Island	3,693	4.81	17,746	23.30	27,743	36.41	45,489	59.71
South Carolina	95,573	3.31	316,478	9.16	512,321	14.84	828,799	24.00
South Dakota					53,946	1.17	53,946	1.17
Tennessee	662,900	2.21	1,462,021	7.20	1,890,491	9.32	3,352,512	16.52
Texas	126,808	4.21	533,447	10.47	3,183,826	62.50	3,717,273	72.97
Utah					1,818	.14	1,818	.14
Vermont	79,706	3.76	299,674	32.11	426,515	45.70	726,189	77.81
Virginia	328,460	2.58	847,265	19.28	1,975,050	44.95	2,822,315	64.23
Virgin Islands					52	1.20	52	1.20
Washington	4,935	6.08	29,991	1.95	153,406	9.95	183,397	11.90
West Virginia	145,572	3.69	537,659	22.75	701,430	29.67	1,239,089	52.42
Wisconsin	1,220,870	1.92	2,341,201	45.57	773,645	15.06	3,114,846	60.63
Wyoming					53,293	2.60	53,293	2.60
Total	15,173,186	2.50	37,993,015	19.79	34,821,132	18.14	72,814,147	37.93

[1] Includes data for the liming materials used under National Bulletin Practice A-4, and for all other practices which included cost-shares for liming materials. The tonnage item was computed on the basis of the total cost-share for all liming materials used and the county average rate of assistance, as reported by counties on form ACP-300.

[2] Includes all eligible minerals other than liming materials.

[3] Includes liming materials and commercial fertilizers.

[4] In terms of standard ground limestone equivalent.

[5] These data are included in the applicable columns for the related National Bulletin practices contained in table 2 and are not in addition to such data.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the figure which I used, approximately $73 million. I submit that is the correct figure for 1959, and that it is the best estimate that we have of the amount that will be spent under the appropriation for calendar 1962.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not disposed to debate the details of this program with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but, in my opinion, the table to which he refers not only includes the cost of the fertilizer and all of the lime and phosphate, but it also includes a number of other items which go with it, and it is not exclusively devoted to the acquisition of the fertilizer.

But whether that is true or not, I wish to point out that every State of the Union has a right to prescribe its own soil conservation program, subject, of course, to review here in Washington, and to cancel any practices for which demands are too great or which are otherwise inappropriate or not applicable.

In the last few years we have found it necessary to freeze the program throughout the Nation, because of the disposition on the part of the Department of Agriculture here in Washington to impose its views on the State committees.

I wish to say, too, that this plan is the most economical program the Department of Agriculture has ever promulgated to assist farmers. We had the so-called conservation reserve under the soil bank. That deals with many of the same practices that are applicable in this program, and the Federal Government supplied the cost of the full program by paying the cost of installing the practice and then continued to pay rent on the land for 3 to 10 years, whereas under this program the Federal Government pays 50 percent of the practice, and that ends its responsibility and liability. Under this program we have planted 3 million acres of trees. There is no liability for rental payments over a period of years, as there is in the so-called conservation reserve program under the soil bank.

I am surprised that the distinguished Senator from Illinois should pay such high tribute to the Soil Conservation Service on the one hand, and attempt to be so critical of this program on the other hand, because these two programs go hand in hand; indeed, there is a provision in the pending bill which permits the utilization of a small percentage of these funds for the soil conservation districts, and, as I recall, that has amounted to $7½ million a year. These funds support activities of the soil conservation districts, and the supervisors of the soil conservation districts often prescribe conservation practices that are carried out under this program as a means of developing and improving conservation of our soil and water resources in this country through the utlization of these very modest payments. This is a program which has been in existence for a great number of years. It may be that in some sections of the United States it has been abused in the acquisition of lime and other fertilizer materials. I refuse to be too critical of the lime industry for their activities which might be denominated as lobbying. I do not know that they are greatly different from what is pursued by any other beneficiary of any other Federal program. They all have their Washington offices. They all have their ways and means of appearing to undertake to protect their interests. It is true that representatives of the limestone industry have appeared before our committee from time to time to support this program. That is not greatly different from any other program of which I have any knowledge, and I refer not only to the Maritime Commission but to other aspects of government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not fully acquainted with the entertainment provided by the various lobbies. Is it true that the Limestone Institute gives very good dinners?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not know about that. I have never attended one. I cannot qualify as an expert in that field. Perhaps some of our brethren who have attended such dinners may wish to purge themselves. If they wish to do so, they may do so now. I have never attended one myself. If any of our colleagues has attended such a dinner, apparently they do not desire to herald that fact on the floor. However, that is not greatly different from any other lobbying activity in Washington. I have been invited to dinner by every conceivable kind of organization that is present in Washington to promote its interests in the expenditure of Federal funds.

I have received many invitations to attend dinners. The meat people have a dinner. The milk people give a dinner. The homebuilding people give a dinner. I suppose I get invitations perhaps a hundred times a year to go to some kind of dinner given by these various organizations. I have not attended any of them for a number of years. When I first came to Washington, in my innocence I did go around to a number of these dinners. However, for the last 20 years I have attended none of them.

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say on the merits of the issue, that is, that the conservation of the soil and water in our country is worth the expenditure of this very modest $250 million each year. That expenditure generates expenditures of approximately $600 or $700 million a year for this purpose. The farmers must contribute at least 50 percent. In many cases they contribute more. It is true that efforts have been made to reduce the program. It was cut down in the 80th Congress, over very violent opposition on my part in the Senate. The recently retired Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, endeavored violently to cut this program. The budget estimate for 1958 was $125 million; in 1959, $100 million; in 1960, $100 million; in 1962, the earlier estimate was $100 million. Congress was so convinced of the merits of this program that it carried it on at $250 million a year.

When I analyze all of the different items in this enormous agricultural bill, I must say that in my opinion the future welfare of this Nation is better served by the expenditure of this $250 million than by any equivalent sum that is carried in the bill.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Each year I have had the privilege of rising on the floor of the Senate to commend the Senator from Georgia for his statesmanship in regard to the agriculture appropriation bill. I do not want to miss the opportunity to do it again this year. Again I wish to thank him in behalf of the best interests of our country. He knows my views on the subject of conservation. I strongly support him.

I was disappointed some time ago, when I fought on the floor of the Senate for conservation of open spaces in connection with the housing bill, to find some of my good friends in the Senate voting against that proposal. That was a mistake. I believe it would be making a mistake to vote against conserving the soil of this country for future generations.

The Senator knows my speech on this subject. I am not going to repeat it. However, I believe that it has never been successfully answered. It is simply that he and I and all the rest of the American people are but the trustees of this land. No farmer owns a farm in the United States. All the farmer has is a legal title to it, recorded in the courthouse.

But it really belongs to future generations. It is God's gift to us, and we have the obligation of serving as trustees in order to leave it in better condition. The Senator from Georgia knows the meaning of trusteeship in connection with soil conservation. I applaud him again for his leadership.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon, both for his kind words and for his cooperation in sustaining this very important program.

Much could be said to illustrate the vital importance of the program to future generations. I shall not discuss that subject in detail. However, it so happens that 1 million acres of land in this country are being taken out of cultivation every year for the construction of highways and airports and for the development of subdivisions to take care of our almost exploding population. One million acres a year are gone.

When I first came to the Senate, there were about 5½ acres of cultivable land for every person in the United States on which to furnish the food and fiber necessary for his sustenance. Due to the decrease in the number of acres and the increase in the population, less than 3 acres of land are now available for the support and maintenance of every American and that amount will decrease as the years pass. That trend charges the Congress with the fearful responsibility of making certain that those acres which remain in production will prove adequate, so far as we can project our minds into the future, so that the Americans who will follow in succeeding generations will have available to them the soil necessary to provide the good life which we now enjoy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much money does the bill provide for the Agriculture Research Service? I think that is title 1. How much money is provided for the finding of new uses for farm products to be used in industry and for new markets for farm products?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would take a few minutes to compile that information. For utilization, research, and development, a little less than $20 million is provided.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not find that in the report. Under what heading is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not in the committee report. This is a very large volume, and the subject is covered in much detail in it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where does it appear in the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not in the report.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under what heading is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is under research, which is the first item in the report.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amount under research, the first item, is $71 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it is $78 million.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, $78 million. What proportion of that amount will go toward the finding of new uses for farm products in industry and for new markets?

Mr. RUSSELL. A little short of $20 million.

Mr. CAPEHART. And the balance of it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, it goes for all kinds of research—to develop new seeds and new strains to cope with diseases which attack plants. It provides for insect control and many other research activities.

Through the test tube, we have seen the most spectacular increase in the production of agricultural commodities in this country that the world has ever seen. Despite all his economic difficulties and handicaps the American farmer is unchallenged as the leading agricultural producer of the world.

We talk about this, that, and the other thing, and put much of the blame for what is happening on Khrushchev and the Soviet Government. However, one area in which we have unquestioned superiority is the American farm. Each American farmer produces many times as much as the Russian farmer; and the Russians have food shortages, while we have surpluses. One American farmer furnishes more food and fiber than 23 of his fellow Americans can use. In Russia one farmer affords scanty fare and clothing for two of his fellow Russians.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in hearty accord with the amount of money which is appropriated for these purposes, and I have always been. I have no objection to it at all. I think it is a worthwhile cause.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that that is not all the money which is provided; this amount is for purely Federal activities. Some $36 million are also provided for the State experiment stations, which do a large amount of research in cooperation with the Federal Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in hearty accord with the program as the Senator from Georgia has outlined it. I am in hearty accord with the work of the State universities.

However, one of the things which I think we as a Congress ought to do—and I have been talking about it and introducing bills concerning it for many years—is to show the farmer how to grow and produce more and more for new industrial purposes. I believe we make a mistake when we do not appropriate money and pass legislation to spend whatever amount of money is necessary to discover new uses for farm products in industry, so that when the farmer produces bigger crops, as a result of the money Congress is appropriating to show him how to do so, he will have the markets for them. That is what I have been fighting and arguing for over a period of many years. I think it will require separate legislation, because laboratories and other facilities must be provided.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Indiana has made many interesting statements about the many benefits which could flow from a crash program for increased agricultural production for industrial uses.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to have new uses found for cotton, corn, and wheat. If we help the farmer to grow more per acre, then we should help to provide larger and newer markets for what he grows. That will require separate legislation. I shall offer a bill for that purpose or an amendment to a farm bill, if that be appropriate.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, the Senator from Indiana has offered such a proposal in previous years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe I am correct in stating that the Senate passed such a bill on three occasions, but on each occasion the House failed to do so. I wish to make a record now, because to me such a proposal is the only real solution to the farm problem. We are now considering a $6 billion appropriation bill for the benefit of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of that amount is not for the farmers. About $3.4 billion is provided for foreign aid.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are giving away surplus food products because there is no market for the surpluses which are grown.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. We propose to spend $2 billion, or whatever the amount is, for agricultural foreign aid because the farmers grow more than they have a market for.

When a farm bill is before the Senate, I shall offer an amendment to this effect. I should like to see whatever amount of money is necessary, spent to develop new uses and markets for surplus farm products—and not only surplus products, but also to enable the farmers to grow more and more.

My vision of the American farm is to have every acre tilled every year, to grow more per acre, instead of paying the farmers for not growing, but letting the land lie idle. I should like to see new industrial uses developed for the farm products, so that farmers may grow more and more, and not less.

If that can be done, as the able Senator from Georgia knows so well, then the general economy of the Nation will be improved. The railroads and trucks will haul more farm products; the farmer will buy more fertilizer, more lime, more gasoline and oil, and the general economy of the country will be improved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Indiana overlooks one important factor. The Nation will save the expense of disposing of surplus farm produce.

Mr. CAPEHART. The United States will be saved hundreds of millions of dollars.

I hope the Senate this year will again legislate on this subject as it has on a number of occasions in the past. Then I hope the House this year will concur in the action of the Senate, so that we may move forward with a program to develop new uses for farm products in industry; so that we may enable the taxpayers to save the hundreds of millions of dollars a year which are spent to buy the surplus products which farmers grow; and thus to improve the general economy of the Nation.

Throughout our Nation's history, there have been times when new industries and new products have improved the economy. Before the 1900's, it was the railroads. Later it was heavy industry. Then came the automobile industry, and in the last 20 years it has been the electronics industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Electronics offers great possibilities for a program of finding new uses, such as the Senator speaks of.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a manufacturer and as one who has had much to do with research, I can visualize a 20-year period in which money could be spent for research, engineering, and new plants in order to develop new uses for farm products in industry. I believe we would find that such a program would give a boost to the general economy of the Nation, would reduce taxes, would increase employment, would create new jobs, and give the economy a real lift.

I am so sold on the idea that I think if we had gone into it in earnest 10 years ago, or less, we would today possibly have no unemployment. We would have general prosperity without subsidies, and would benefit industries and farmers.

I know the able Senator from Georgia has always been in favor of this sort of thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Indiana has indeed been a valiant exponent of a real program of utilization research and development.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question? I thought the Senator from Vermont desired to ask a question; but, first, I should like to ask a question, if I may.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator from Georgia advise me whether the amount

recommended by the committee for this item exceeds the amount set forth in the budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does; it exceeds it by $100 million.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Georgia state why the committee felt as it did?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I shall be glad to do so. In my opinion, a program of $250 million is as small a program as we can carry on and still justify the administrative expense involved in the program. If the program is cut to $150 million, the administrative expense is just as great as it is for a $250 million program—or almost $40 million. In my judgment, it would be preferable to eliminate the program entirely, rather than make it a $150 million program, because I do not think we could justify spending almost one-third for administrative purposes.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, coming from a State which has cooperated 100 percent on the ACP program since the first year it began, I have perhaps more than usual interest in this program.

When the Senator from Illinois states that we need no more acres to support our population today, he is correct—provided the population would remain stable. When he says the lime and fertilizer business is a good business, he is also correct. Our agriculture makes good business for many persons. As of the recent reports from the Department of Agriculture, more than 7 million persons today are working on the farms, and more than twice that number are supplying farm materials or are processing farm commodities. So, actually, today at least one-third of all the people of this country depend upon our farms for their living.

When the Senator from Illinois states that the farmers obtain some increased benefits from the application of lime and phosphate, he is also correct, because a good farmer will obtain increased benefits from the application of lime, from the second year until the twentieth year, when most of its value will have been lost.

The Senator from Illinois might also have said that despite the benefits received, today the per capita farm income is something less than half the per capita income of all the people of the United States.

The reason why we have to keep this program going and the reason why we have had to keep it going is that we wish to keep ahead of our requirements.

I have no sympathy with those who say we should produce only what we need, and that that is all there is to it. Instead, we must look ahead.

The work we do under the ACP, as I have said, is most important. The value of the superphosphate will probably be gone in 5, 6, or 8 years; I am not quite sure how long it will take. The value of the lime which is applied to the soil will remain in the ground to some degree for nearly 20 years, and then it will be necessary to apply more lime.

However, the reforestation work that is carried on is of benefit to those who will come two or three generations from now. Undoubtedly, a farmer who plants trees today will never see them harvested, unless he is a young man and unless he happens to be planting slash pine or the pulp pine which now is grown extensively in some of the Southern States.

The other work of leveling the ground and providing ditches, drainage, and so forth, will be there for the next generation, and the generation after that, to make use of.

Our population is increasing at the rate of 3 million a year; and when the value of lime which is applied today is completely exhausted from the land, the population of our country will be at least 60 million more than it is today.

As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, we are losing a million acres of land a year for housing developments, factories, airports, highways, and for other purposes. Unfortunately, much of that land is our best land—particularly that which is taken for housing developments and for industrial purposes.

Today, our food production is the strongest argument we have in dealing with other nations. When our representatives sit down at the bargaining table with the representatives of other countries, the very fact that we have a large supply of wheat, grain, and other farm commodities at our backs strengthens our hand tremendously; and it goes without saying that many countries of the world which today are associated with us are now considered friends of the West because we were able to meet their requirements for food and fiber at times when perhaps they could not have continued to exist as independent or democratic nations if we had not been able to help them in that way.

As the Senator from Oregon has said, we hold this land in trusteeship for those who will come after us; and I believe we must hold this land in good condition.

Frankly, I am worried because of the strenuous efforts being made to reduce the production of our farms today, because we will need it sooner than we now realize. Therefore, I say we must keep the land which now remains—that which remains after we take out of production the land that is needed for the construction of airports, highways, and so forth—in the very best condition, for the benefit of those who will come after us.

Thus, Mr. President, I support the bill, rather than the amendment submitted by my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall certainly be brief in my remarks in support of the position taken by the committee in regard to the pending matter, and also in regard to the position taken by the committee in regard to the Douglas amendment. In support thereof, I have a very pertinent and at the same time quite an interesting and revealing statement made by Dr. Byron Shaw, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, at the hearings this year. Dr. Shaw is given to making accurate statements; and in his official testimony he stated:

> The Nation's consumers are not aware of the great savings that come to them as a result of improved farming efficiency. If our farmers were using today the methods they used in 1940, it would cost an extra $13 billion—or 40 percent more than was spent in 1959—to produce the Nation's food and fiber. This figures out to $288 for each family in the country.

In other words, Mr. President, improved efficiency, improved methods, better land, better fertilizers, and a combination of these, have improved methods so much since as recently as 1940 that the consumers are saving $13 billion a year—or, in 1959, 40 percent of the cost—in their expenditures for food and fiber; and that amounts to $288 for each family.

Let me say that one of the major contributing factors in this great saving and reduction has been the investment which has been made over these years in this very program of ACP payments that improve the land and the production.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not unfortunate, however, from the farmer's standpoint that, as the able Senator has just stated, although he is possibly in the most efficient of our industries, producing foodstuffs costing the consumer some $13 billion less than it would have many, many years ago, yet the farmer is making so little profit or money and is so hard up, because the prices he receives are so low?

That is true in every phase of farming. The farmer is engaged in a cost-price squeeze. It is discouraging to the farmer to feel that he is so efficient in producing foodstuffs, and produces them so cheaply in comparison with everything else the consumer purchases, that he makes very little money, if any. It is one of those things that I think is not good in America.

Farming is our biggest industry. Yet it is suffering, although it is efficient and is contributing much to the wealth of the Nation, because foodstuffs are produced so cheaply compared to wages and everything else the farmer has to buy.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's alertness in the subject has covered another related point of Dr. Shaw's testimony, when he says:

> However, returns to labor from 1 hour of farmwork in 1950 averaged only 75 cents, compared to earnings from an hour's factory work of $2.22.

Another surprise to many was the statement that "investment per worker in farming now averages $21,300, compared to $15,900 per worker in manufacturing industries."

So there is a striking comparison of investment and return, as well as an increased saving to the consumer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which makes it so much more important that the Government should attack the farm problem on the basis of finding new uses and markets for farm products, so there may be a greater demand for what the farmer grows and produces.

Mr. STENNIS. I know of the Senator's very timely interest and support of the subject which he mentions.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and other Senators have fully covered the merits of the pending proposal and the figure inserted in the bill by the committee, and I conclude my remarks on that subject.

I may be compelled to leave the Chamber when other sections of the bill are discussed. I want to mention one item with reference to the valuable Extension Service, which extends through 50 States. The committee, based on a calculation considered to be correct, intended to provide enough in the item "Payment to States" in the Extension Service to approximately equal the salary increase voted for last year for civil service workers, when we increased their salaries 7½ percent. According to this calculation, the increase in the bill available for those purposes, plus the increase in last year's raise and available for that purpose, will approximately equal the Federal share of the salary increase—a very wholesome provision that I feel sure will have the unanimous support of the Senate. It is hoped this figure will be adequate to meet that intention. If it does not, it will certainly be the purpose of the Senator from Mississippi, and I believe other Senators, to make up the amount next year, so as to generally equalize the Federal share for that important purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the subject may 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 JOHN STENNIS IN SUPPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXTENSION SERVICE

Included in the agricultural appropriations bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee is an item of $59,790,000, for payments to States for the Extension Service, representing an increase of $3,212,000 over the fiscal year 1961 appropriation. Included in this bill also is $2,477,000 for the Federal Extension Service, an increase of $25,000 over the House bill and $23,000 under the budget request.

These increases will make it possible to provide State and county extension personnel with more adequate salaries, in line with the percentage increase granted to Government employees last year. Further, these additional funds will permit the employment of a very limited number of specialized personnel at the Federal level. This will enable the Extension Service to strengthen its educational efforts in efficiency in production and marketing, farm and home management, uderstanding of Government programs, family living, forestry, and 4-H Club work, with special emphasis on the rural areas development program.

At no time since the inauguration of extension work has the job required a higher degree of skill. Modern agriculture is highly complex, requiring the best scientific knowledge and technical know-how.

The Cooperative Extension Service is the educational and informational arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges. It is positive education in action. With the many farm problems confronting us at the present time, these additional funds are necessary for the Extension Service to effectively perform its task of getting research and technical information to farmers, along with furnishing factual information about the programs of the Department of Agriculture to farmers and other people of the Nation.

Throughout the years I have strongly supported appropriations and programs to strengthen our Agricultural Extension Service, because I think the program is the foundation of a strong and prosperous agriculture.

In a large part of the country, including Mississippi, agriculture is still the biggest industry. I know that in my State over 40 percent of all people who work in agriculture or in business depend directly upon farming and farm products. The value of extension work to the agricultural economy of the Nation cannot be measured, but anyone familiar with progress in agriculture will testify that extension work is primarily responsible for many of the outstanding accomplishments over the years. Our extension agents employ a wealth of experience and continuous training in agriculture at the grassroots, helping our farmers improve their methods and crops.

Extension work is an outstanding example of the real result of Federal-State cooperation, and I urge the Senate to approve this appropriation, including the increases, to continue this work which means so much to the country. Surely, no one program of the Federal Government means so much to so many people.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, again, for the reason that I may be compelled to leave the floor, I ask unanimous consent that an additional brief statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point on another item in the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN STENNIS IN SUPPORT OF APPROPRIATION FOR STAFFING BOLL WEEVIL LABORATORY AT MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Included in the agriculture appropriations bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee is an item of $395,000 for staffing the boll weevil research laboratory at Mississippi State University.

The boll weevil, our No. 1 agricultural insect pest, needs and should have the full attention of our scientists. It must be controlled, and I firmly believe it can be eliminated entirely as a major cotton problem. New methods of insect control employing radiant energy, new insecticides, and germ warfare—all harmless to humans, but effective as insect killers—look promising in the fight to eliminate the weevil.

When we review carefully all our agricultural research projects, I do not believe we can find a single problem more critical or more pressing than boll weevil eradication. This pest has been a problem for many years and is one of the most destructive and costly factors in cotton production. This insect alone has resulted in a loss of billions of dollars to the cotton farmer and the cotton industry, and is a major cost factor in about 80 percent of the total cotton acreage in the United States and affects more than 95 percent of all cotton producers.

In recent years, the boll weevil has caused an average annual direct loss of more than $300 million in yields. This annual loss has been suffered although many growers have spent 5 to 6 cents per pound for control measures. Indirect costs resulting from deterioration in quality and immature fibers have also been severe.

My own State of Mississippi has suffered the highest boll weevil loss of any State in the Cotton Belt. During a recent 5-year period, estimates indicate the Mississippi cotton farmers lost 2½ million bales of cotton to the boll weevil and over a million tons of seed—a total cash loss of $407 million. The boll weevil threat will be even greater in the years ahead if we do not find a sound method of eradication.

Mr. President, the Congress has already appropriated funds for the construction of a boll weevil research laboratory at Mississippi State University, and it is rapidly nearing completion. This laboratory will be ready for full operation early during the next fiscal year. The appropriation of $395,000, included in the present bill, is for necessary staffing of the laboratory for the first year's operation. It should be approved so that this vital research work can be commenced.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I believe the Congress and the Government does have the responsibility of enacting those measures which will protect the soil of the country, and I have supported such measures, but I do not believe the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which I have cosponsored, provides any restriction of soil conservation in this country.

For instance, the drainage program in which the Government participates would not be restricted if the amendment were adopted. All that we are trying to do is to stop the giving away by the U.S. Government of a lot of free lime and fertilizer to increase the productive capacity of our farms at a time when we have more production than we know what to do with.

At a time when we have $8 billion to $10 billion worth of surplus crops, at a time when the Government is supporting the production of crops at a profit to benefit the farmers, and at a time when the Government is paying $40 to $50 an acre to take land out of production, it does not make sense to have the Government provide free fertilizer and lime in order to increase productivity on the land which is left in production.

This fact that this was not needed was recognized by the preceding administration, by both the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the increased appropriation is opposed very properly this year by the present Secretary of Agriculture. I repeat, the Bureau of the Budget has not approved the additional $100 million, nor do I find where the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, has recommended it as being necessary. To the contrary, they said it is unnecessary and contrary to the other phases of the agricultural program. They are in favor of our amendment to cut this $100 million.

I think it is time we stop and ask ourselves the question of how long the Government can continue to borrow money, paying interest on it, in order to increase the productive capacity of land on the one hand, and borrow money and pay interest in order to take agricultural land out of production on the other hand. It is these contradictory programs which are bankrupting us.

Someone may say that $100 million is a small part of a $6 billion program, but $100 million is still a lot of money to provide over and above the sum which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and over and above what was testified was necessary by the Department of Agriculture. It means $2 million a week. That is $400,000 a day for

a 5-day working week. It means $50,000 an hour for each 8-hour day.

If we do not accept the amendment we shall be paying out $100 million above the budget request to increase the productive capacity of farms to increase the agricultural surpluses being stored in Government warehouses.

I think it would be much better to strike out the provision for $100 million, and then restore in the bill a small amount of money for research. Research is something which farmers cannot do for themselves. The Government can really help by providing more research. Certainly, more research is something we need. For too often we find the Government and unfortunately the committees of Congress being miserly whenever we approach research programs, but at the same time we spend millions of dollars on programs which in effect hurt rather than help the farmer.

This $100 million is not for conservation of the soil. Let us be realistic—it just produces more crops.

I think the $100 million should be stricken out in the name of good commonsense, not only for this program but also in order to cut back the cost of the storage program for storing surplus agricultural commodities. It will still leave $150 million for other real conservation programs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the pending amendment an amendment to eliminate something from the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have joined the Senator from Illinois in an amendment to reduce the $250 million item to $150 million, which is exactly the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Secretary of Agriculture. Our amendment would reduce the appropriations to be provided by the bill by $100 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reasoning supporting the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware is that on the one hand we are paying money to reduce farm production, and, on the other hand, by such a provision in the bill we would be paying money to increase production. One or the other is wrong; both cannot be right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. I think I have had as much experience with agriculture as some other Senators. The argument that one can build the soil up for 20 years in advance is misleading. By putting on fertilizer and lime today that will not be the result. The effect of the fertilizer will be gone in a couple of years, and the lime will last not more than 5 years. Those items must be put on the land at regular intervals. Fertilizer in most areas should be put on the land every year, and lime should be put on every 3 or 5 years at the outside.

This free lime and fertilizer means increased production on the farms and more agricultural commodities to be put into Government warehouses.

It is a direct contradiction with respect to the program upon which we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to take land out of production, good agricultural land, in order to cut down the surpluses. I think this will be a complete waste of money in itself and, in addition, it will cost us another $40 to $50 million to support and to store the agricultural commodities which will be produced as a result of spending the $100 million.

The amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement of the purpose which has motivated the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware in espousing the amendment declares the soundness of it. I simply cannot see why we should, on the one hand, pay to take land out of production so as to reduce surpluses, and, on the other hand, pay $100 million to increase production or to make the land available 20 years from now for increased production.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This increased production potential is not to be used 20 years from now. As the Senator from Delaware has said, phosphate would improve the yield for perhaps 2 years. Lime, as I understand the situation, would improve the land for not more than 5 years. These are not permanent processes of soil building, but temporary processes to increase yields. Like the flowers of the field, they will shortly vanish and disappear.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I gladly subscribe to the views expressed by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware, and I shall be glad to vote for the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois. I certainly hope the amendment will be agreed to.

I think in the field of good, constructive research the Government can very properly spend even more money than it has spent, but I do not think we would be helping the American farmer by refusing to adopt this amendment. The strongest support given before the committee—and I have read the testimony—was by the Limestone Institute, by the people who will sell the lime. The proposal was opposed by one of the leading farm organizations of America.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I support the bill and the chairman of the committee in the argument for the increased appropriation. I say that at the beginning. I have always supported these programs.

I believe there might be an implication, on the part of one who reads what the Senator has said, that fertilizer and limestone apply directly toward the production of row crops or grain, which are in surplus; for example, corn or wheat. Is it not correct that the fertilizer and lime to be made available under the program could not be applied to the land in the year in which they are made available toward the production of grain or row crops?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps; but it does not mean anything, because, as I said before, the lime will improve the soil for an average of 3 to 5 years and the fertilizer will improve the soil for a year or two. The lime and fertilizer can be applied to the soil this year with a cover crop, then next year the farmer can have a corn crop and thereby get the benefit. Therefore, the program would increase the production of the land, as the Senator from Kentucky well knows.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the purpose of the program is to improve the soil and to promote better soil practices. I believe it could be inferred by someone who did not understand—I know it is not the Senator's intention to give such an implication—that the fertilizer and lime are to be used in a year to produce the crops which may be in surplus in that same year. That, as the Senator knows, is not the true statement of fact.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The fertilizer and lime may not be used in the same year, but they will produce increased crops for the next year. Crops are being produced this year with last year's lime, and the Government will put those crops into a Government warehouse. Those crops are being produced with the free lime and fertilizer furnished last year. While the crops may come along a year late the answer is the same although technically they may not be crops resulting directly from the use of fertilizer and lime in the year in which it is provided.

Mr. COOPER. For example, if in 1961 lime or fertilizer should be applied to a particular acreage, there would be grass or some legume on that acreage and not corn or wheat or some crop in surplus. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The lime would be good for an average of 3 to 5 years, depending upon the soil. The fertilizer would provide benefits for 1 or 2 or 3 years. The mere fact that the lime and fertilizer are put on in one year and that corn or wheat or some other crop is not produced that particular year would not mean anything. The fertilizer and lime would produce those same crops the next year. It will be in use over a 5-year period of time. The field can be used the next year to produce surplus crops. That is certainly true. The result is the same.

Mr. COOPER. In each year the particular acreage is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In each year the particular acreage is withdrawn as a result of the Government paying another $40 or $50 per acre under another program.

Mr. COOPER. The acreage is withdrawn from the production of the crop each year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is withdrawn if the Government pays.

Mr. COOPER. The land is withdrawn from the production of the crop.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The land is withdrawn from the production of the crop for the year in which the farmer gets free lime and fertilizer, but the land goes back into production immediately the next year unless the Government pays $40 to $50 an acre to keep it out of production.

Mr. COOPER. The point is that every year the program is in effect x acres are withdrawn from the production of crops which might be in surplus.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would say that every year there are x acres out of production, but the land is not necessarily withdrawn from production, because the farmers, long before Washington bureaucrats ever heard of the soil conservation program, rotated their crops. I have been on a farm. Farmers rotated crops before the Department of Agriculture ever heard of it. Frankly, I think the Department got the idea from the farmers. Some farmer came in to tell them about it, and the Department said, "That is a wonderful idea; now we will tell the farmers how to do it."

The farmers have rotated crops for years, and in fact for generations. The Senator's father did.

Mr. COOPER. He did.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Our grandfathers did. All we are doing is paying the farmers for something they would do anyway, the farmers knew before the Secretary of Agriculture did that this is a good practice.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think that is quite correct. It is true that the program has taught many farmers or has helped to teach many farmers, even as a result of payments, that rotation of crops is a good thing, which will improve farming and farmland throughout the country. The Senator knows that. One has only to drive through the country to know that this program has improved farming throughout the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would agree that it has improved some farmland, but to say that the farmland would not have been improved without the program I do not think is proper. Many farmers have never participated but have built up their soil. In some instances they have done equally as good a job without the program, if not better. To say that the only way this soil improvement could have been achieved was by having the Federal Government pay them is in my opinion not correct.

I have said that there are many features of the program of soil conservation of which I approve and which I will support. I have supported them. I think we should build up the soil for the future. However, I do not think that by giving free fertilizer and lime we shall be building for the future. We will simply build up surpluses for tomorrow or, to be exact, for the next year.

It will not help the position of the American farmer who is already handicapped in the market by these surpluses which are holding down farm prices.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to repeat what I said a year ago. Following my affirmative vote to reduce the amount to be appropriated for limestone and other fertilizers from $250 million to $150 million, the limestone dealers circulated a letter to the farmers of Ohio in which they said, in effect, "Dear Mr. Farmer, you will be interested to know that your Senator, FRANK LAUSCHE, voted to reduce from $250 million down to $150 million the appropriation providing you with limestone. We do not write you this letter for the purpose of influencing you against him, but we thought, Mr. Farmer, that you would like to know what he did."

Such was the purport of the letter which the limestone dealers sent out 2 years ago. If I had any question about the propriety of what I did when I cast my vote, after I read that letter I became more than ever convinced that the sponsors of the bill ought to have my vigorous rebuff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The Limestone Institute sent such a letter to the farmers in the States of all Senators who supported the position stated by the Senator from Ohio. I am confident they will do so again. Significantly that letter was signed by a man who is making an easy living in Washington as a lobbyist for the Limestone Institute. He is a man who I doubt has ever done a day's work on a farm in his life. It could be said he makes his living farming the farmers, not the farm. I doubt if he knows what a real farm looks like. He makes his money in Washington selling lime to the U.S. Government. This bill represents a $100 million order for him. Nevertheless one of the largest farm organizations in America testified that the extra $100 million was not for the benefit of farmers, and they agreed it would be better if the item were deleted.

The Secretaries of Agriculture under both the preceding and the present administrations, men who are supposed to have the interests of farmers at heart, have said that the farmers of America would be better off if the extra $100 million provided in the bill were saved for the taxpayers rather than spent to increase the productive capacity of farms.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what farm organization does the Senator refer?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding that the American Farm Bureau and others have repeatedly taken a position against the proposal on the basis that it was not in the interest of farmers. Yet no organization has stood more strongly for good soil conservation practices and good farming methods than the American Farm Bureau. That organization has assisted and supported such programs as drainage, research, development, and other sound phases of the farm program. It has been a strong advocate of such programs as would help the farmers.

There are many areas of farming in which the Government can help the American farmer. As I said before, I believe research is one of the fields.

These farm organizations have been strong advocates of extended research programs.

If only 5 percent of this $100 million were earmarked for research both the farmers and taxpayers would benefit.

If there were a shortage of productive capacity or a shortage of food, the full program could be justified. If a war were going on and we needed the food there would be a reason for the full appropriation. Certainly there is no reason for it today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that both the conservative Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, and the allegedly liberal Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, expressed opposition to the appropriation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I so understand. The Budget Bureau in both administrations opposed a $250 million annual program. I have read the testimony, and I have failed to see any point at which Mr. Freeman endorsed the program.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. For the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I can say that the same organization sent out letters to farmers in New York State. I received a copy of such a letter. It merely enclosed a brochure that the organization had sent out. I think most farmers have shown the good sense, as evidenced by the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, to favor this amendment, and I am happy to join the Douglas-Williams axis in support of the amendment. The Senators are sound in the position that they have taken. Under their amendment, we can save a little money without seriously impairing a good program. I certainly will support the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The saving would be $100 million.

Mr. KEATING. The amount is minor when considered alongside the astronomical figures in which we customarily deal. But unless we watch very carefully items like the one about which we are speaking, we shall not be able to meet the huge national defense needs and other national needs our country must fulfill. We are being given an opportunity today to make some of the sacrifices that we have heard so much about lately. It seems to me that this is an appropriate place for a saving to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. As I said before, the strongest testimony that was given for the full appropriation was given by Mr. Robert M. Koch, official representative of the Limestone Institute. I have not noticed this year the testimony of the representative of the American Farm Bureau Association, but I know that in preceding years representatives have testified in favor of cutting the program, and I understand that this year their testimony was the same.

Mr. KEATING. I am told that representatives did testify this year and that their position on this issue is unchanged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. While the saving, as has been pointed out, may be small in the minds of some as compared with the $6 billion in the bill, nevertheless a saving of $100 million a year amounts to approximately $2 million a week, $40,000 a day, figuring an 8-hour day and a 5-day working week. The adoption of this amendment would result in a saving of $100 million to the American taxpayers. Furthermore, the Budget Bureau did not approve this $100 million.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Has the Senator asked for the yeas and nays?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have not, but I shall ask for the yeas and nays. I think there should be a record vote.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I see that I am beginning to find support for the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before the vote on the amendment, we should realize that the program is a cooperative program. The Federal Government makes a substantial contribution over the Nation as a whole, but when it gets down to the individual farmer, he must participate in the program, and then receives only a portion of the benefits from the Federal Government. I believe it is an essential program, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will not reduce the amount of the item as reported by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I refer to the item of $250 million for building soil and assisting the farmers, in view of the testimony given that the items are most helpful and necessary. I sincerely hope that Senators will not vote against the proposal.

If I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to speak on an item appearing on page 15, line 11, of the pending bill under the title "Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research." I note that the committee increased the item from $4,515,000 to $4,795,000.

The report on this bill, page 8, entitled "Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research," reads as follows:

For marketing research, the committee recommends $4,795,000 be appropriated. This is an increase of $280,000 over the estimate and the House bill and an increase of $577,800 over 1961. The recommended increase consists of: (a) $160,000 to develop plans and specifications for a research facility on a site to be obtained without cost, and to intensify the marketing research on peanuts; (b) $60,000 to initiate a study of maintenance of quality in citrus; (c) $40,000 to accelerate horticultural research in the packaging, handling, and related problems affecting the quality of flowers after harvesting; and (d) $20,000 to conduct a study of methods for objective gaging of maturity of apples as an aid to harvesting and quality control.

I appreciate these projects are valuable research products.

During the hearings I appeared before the subcommittee, under the very able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and stressed the need for a grain marketing research center and suggested that it be built at Manhattan, Kans.

I have prepared an amendment, which, if approved, would make available $140,000 for planning this project. There can be no question as to the need for early construction of the marketing research center and I am pleased to advise that Kansas State University at Manhattan, Kans., has offered to deed to the Federal Government a site of 5 acres for such a laboratory. As most of you know, Kansas State University is considered among the outstanding agricultural universities of the Nation; and in the field of wheat, flour, and related products, it is the outstanding university. It works very closely with the Department of Agriculture.

Great Plains Wheat, Inc., which is an organization representing more than 250,000 wheatgrowers in the Midwest, has been working quite closely with Kansas State University and myself in support of this laboratory. At this time we think that the building and related facilities could be constructed for an estimated $1,900,000.

The Grain Marketing Research Center I propose would be the type of activity that is a function of marketing research in the Agricultural Marketing Service of USDA. The objective of this proposed grain research center would be to develop new and more efficient ways of making U.S. grain and grain products more desirable to domestic and foreign buyers and users. This research would seek to prevent waste and spoilage and maintain quality in the channels of trade, improve efficiency and lower cost of handling, storage, transportation, and distribution of grain and grain products, and improve grade standards and sampling and grain grading methods and equipment.

Five States—Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, and Oklahoma—raise 50 percent of the winter wheat, and 41 percent of the total wheat produced in the United States. The four States besides Kansas all border Kansas, and would of course have access to this proposed laboratory.

I appreciate the problem of the chairman of the subcommittee. I do not like to offer the amendment at this time. However, I wonder whether the chairman has any suggestions to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Kansas has been very diligent in pursuing this matter. I believe this is the second year that he has presented it to the Committee on Appropriations. It is a very worthy project, and one that eventually will be constructed. Certain difficulties are involved in connection with the subject. In the first place, we did not have a budget estimate, although I understand the project stands very high on the list of priorities for facilities within the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Another little difficulty has been in connection with the matter of the location of the laboratory. The committee was not unanimous in its views as to where the laboratory should be located. Wheat is grown in a great many States of the Union. Kansas is a great wheat State. There are other great wheat States. Therefore, the committee decided to pass the matter over for this year in the hope of having a budget estimate submitted for the item, which would establish the location of the site, and in that way we would be absolved of the responsibility of deciding its location between several great wheat producing States. We have no budget estimate to guide us. Generally speaking, when a budget estimate is submitted, the location is determined. In my judgment, we will get a budget estimate on the laboratory—not right away, but in the very near future.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished chairman. I have every reason to believe that the Senator has made a correct estimate of the situation. As I have said, when it comes to the location of the laboratory, I merely wish to say again that Kansas is in the center of a five-State area—Missouri, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas—which raises 50 percent of the winter wheat of this Nation.

It seems only logical that that area should be given consideration when it comes to deciding on the location. I sincerely hope that next year we may have the privilege of having a budget recommendation on this item. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that it would certainly resolve embarrassment for the chairman of the committee if we had a budget estimate, so as to locate the laboratory at a definite place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

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 Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

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 "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

Mr. BARTLETT (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 81]

YEAS—26

Beall	Douglas	Miller
Bennett	Fong	Pastore
Boggs	Goldwater	Pell
Bush	Hartke	Smith, Mass.
Butler	Hickenlooper	Tower
Clark	Hruska	Williams, N.J.
Cotton	Javits	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Keating	Young, Ohio
Dirksen	Lausche	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Allott	Hickey	Moss
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Cannon	Jordan	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Mo.	Scott
Church	Long, La.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dworshak	McCarthy	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—10

Bartlett	Engle	Smathers
Bridges	Gruening	Wiley
Case, N.J.	Long, Hawaii	
Chavez	Randolph	

So the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the other body an effort was made to provide some funds for the study of the agricultural market center at Boston, Mass. However, through an error in the other body, the $75,000 which was involved was placed under the heading of "Payments to States."

The Senate committee, not being informed of what the money was for, struck out that item. As a matter of fact, it should be under the item of "Marketing research."

The project seems to be a desirable one. Therefore, I move that the bill be amended on page 15, in line 14, by striking out the figure "$4,795,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,870,000", in order that this important study may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations with reference to an item found in the budget and in the bill for research on amylose corn. I understand some $277,000 has been allocated for that purpose for fiscal year 1962, which is an equivalent amount to that which will have been expended for the current fiscal year.

It is my further understanding a request had been made for an increase in that figure. I am wondering what the reasons were for having rejected that increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, several elements were involved in that action.

In the first place, the sum which was set up in the budget for the project was relatively small. I do not have the figure before me at this time, but it was $40,000 or $50,000. The committee felt, when it compared this program with the other research programs, that the $277,000 for its support was a very substantial sum. When it is considered that the total for every phase of agricultural research in this country is only $78 million and is divided up into several hundred different projects, $277,000 constitutes a very substantial project.

We increased the overall appropriation for research in this area, and if the Department desires to allocate more funds for this purpose, it may do so. We have never been penurious in our allocations for research. A very large request was submitted by some organization for research on grain, something like $1 million, and we did not feel that the facts presented justified it.

There are other funds provided in the bill. There is a contingent fund of $1 million which could be allocated for this purpose, in addition to the increase in the general appropriations for research.

Mr. HRUSKA. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say that the total appropriation for research approximated $2 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; $78 million.

Mr. HRUSKA. The entire agricultural research service?

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not include the payment to the States. The States direct that research.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was in the range of $78 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. Seventy-eight million dollars.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, that includes almost every conceivable form of research to deal with insects, diseases that attack plants, diseases of animals, new diseases that bring about great losses. Personally, I feel this is a very substantial sum for this research, but there is other money available there if the Department desires to allocate it.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am grateful for the Senator's explanation.

Because of industrial purposes to which amylose corn can be devoted, there is great interest in high amylose corn in Nebraska. Starch refined from ordinary corn is about 25 percent amylose and 75 percent amylopectin. But in my State the high amylose corn ranges up to 65 percent amylose content. The aim is to do even better.

There are vast possibilities for diverting this crop from normal channels of consumption and Government storage to industrial purposes. Hence the constant effort to advance even higher amylose content and processes for separating pure amylose and amylopectin fractions from ordinary dent corn.

Among those active locally and regionally in this field are the Corn Industries Research Foundation, the Midwest Research Institute, the A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co., and the Institute of Paper Chemistry. They have cooperated with the Nebraska Department of Agriculture in this program. In fact, the progress and efforts along this line were noted recently in a June 11, 1961, Saturday Evening Post editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SCIENCE CALLED ON TO FIND NEW USES FOR FARM SURPLUS

Scientific research conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State agricultural experiment stations has tremendously increased farm production. But there has been no corresponding research to develop uses and markets for the increased production. The State of Nebraska has set out to correct this by establishing an agricultural products industrial utilization research program.

Fourteen research projects are underway. The State's chief grain crops—corn and wheat—furnish most of the materials of these research explorations. Scientists know that many nonfood products can be developed from them. The problem is to create the products desired for commercial uses and to make them economical enough to sell at competitive prices.

Starch is the major component of both corn and wheat and much of the research involves its possibilities. The paper industry is one of the largest users of starch, and research being carried on with the Institute of Paper Chemistry is aimed at the development of improved and more versatile starch products for this market. Other research seeks new uses in the growing plastics field.

Interest in Nebraska's program has spread to neighboring States, and a broader research development seems in sight. To facilitate a regional approach, an Agricultural Products Utilization Association, a nonprofit organization, was incorporated in Nebraska. It will provide the machinery to coordinate the different State programs.

By creating new wealth out of our farm abundance, the Nebraska plan looks like an example of the self-reliance that once was known as an American trait.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, considerable research has been done already by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the amylose field. From 1955 through fiscal year 1961 about $1¼ million was spent on research, and for fiscal year

1962 there is an allocation of about $277,000. After expenditure of that amount, some $1½ million will have been spent by the Federal Department of Agriculture.

This is good foundational work. It is a good pioneering effort upon which States like Nebraska have been able to build. Nebraska is grateful for this pioneering work. There is a large industrial demand, and it is felt that more could be allowed than the $277,000 which is the current level of research work in the Federal budget. However, with the explanation given by the Senator from Georgia on this subject, I am sure further progress will be made and will be in good order. It will be a further foundation for efforts like those being currently conducted in my home State of Nebraska.

Again I thank the Senator from Georgia for his very fine explanation and for his obvious sympathy with this type of agricultural research.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with every form of agricultural research. It is the only weapon we have had to enable the farmers to keep pace with modern-day life in this country.

Mr. HRUSKA. The obvious merit of this type of research is that if it is successful it will divert part of the corn crop for industrial purposes, instead of use in normal channels of consumption, particularly in Government storage, of which there is already too much.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is room to strengthen every aspect of research to increase utilization of our farm products.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the chairman and the members of the Agriculture Subcommittee have done their usual fine job on this difficult appropriation bill. I extend my thanks to this subcommittee for their diligent efforts.

I would like to have had certain additional items included in the bill, but it is impossible for such a committee to satisfy completely every Member of this body. We can always be sure, however, that our requests are given fair and equitable treatment.

The committee's recommendations on agricultural research items are to be commended. Of special significance to Arkansas are additional funds for soybean research and research on air sac diseases in poultry. Soybeans are the second most important crop in Arkansas and research on soybean problems has not kept pace with the growth of this industry. It has been estimated that an increase in productivity of 1 bushel per acre would result in increasing income to soybean producers by $50 million. The committee's approval of $100,000 to strengthen the research program will pay ample dividends in future years.

I was pleased that the committee recommended an additional $250,000 above the House appropriation of $387,800 to accelerate research on air sac diseases in poultry. Poultry producers, and those of us who represent poultry producing areas, have wrestled with the air sac problem for years. These additional funds will insure that the problem is at last given the attention it deserves. I hope that the Government's research will soon result in finding a permanent and practical solution to the air sac problem.

The House committee's action in providing a $1 million contingency fund for special research problems should be very helpful to farmers throughout the Nation. This fund will give the Agricultural Research Service the capability of taking prompt and effective research action whenever a serious problem arises. It will give needed flexibility to Agricultural Research Service in coping with emergency problems.

I regret that the committee did not provide funds for construction of a soil and water conservation research station in the lower Mississippi Valley. Although this project is rather low on the Agricultural Research Service priority list, I am convinced that the soil and water conservation problems in the delta area are not receiving the attention they should. I intend to continue to work to get the Agricultural Research Service to move this project up on the priority list in hopes that we can get appropriations to initiate construction on it in the 1963 fiscal year.

In another phase of soil and water conservation, the committee is to be complimented for its approval of the full budget estimate for the watershed protection program. This program has been neglected far too long. It has been hampered by inadequate funding and by unrealistic feasibility criteria. The amount for the program contained in the bill represents an increase of slightly more than $17 million above the amount appropriated last year. There is a tremendous backlog of projects, both for planning and construction. These additional funds will help in reducing this backlog. It has been estimated that flood losses in small unprotected watersheds throughout the country each year are substantially greater than the small amount spent on the watershed program. The small watershed program has proven its worth and I know that it will continue to grow in importance as the results become more evident.

I was pleased at the committee's action to continue the agricultural conservation program at the present level. The conservation practices financed through this program have resulted in greatly strengthening the Nation's soil and water resources. This program recognizes that our soil is a highly perishable asset and that it is in the national interest that we conserve it to the best of our ability. The farmers of my State are completely sold on this program and continuation of it at the existing level is necessary if they are to be given the proper encouragement and incentive to continue the fine work they are doing.

The committee has taken a realistic attitude by increasing the authorization for the Rural Electrification Administration. It was obvious that with the recent approval of the large loan to the Indiana cooperative there would not be sufficient funds available unless there was a substantial increase in the budget request. The $50 million increase in the authorization should insure that the REA program is continued at an adequate level.

I am pleased that the committee increased the appropriation for the school lunch program. Many States, including Arkansas, ran into difficulties in financing their lunch programs this year. The $15 million increase in the direct appropriation above last year's appropriation should go a long way toward preventing such problems from happening again next year.

I was especially interested in the language contained in the committee's report on the bill concerning the importance of the foreign market development program. As the committee pointed out, this cooperative program between Government and industry has been most successful in promoting increased exports of many agricultural products. I agree fully with the committee's recommendation that the program should be substantially expanded in size and broadened in scope. Market development programs are in operation around the world promoting sales of the products which are of great importance to Arkansas—cotton, soybeans, rice, and poultry. Foreign markets have always been essential to American farmers, and there is no indication that this situation will change in the foreseeable future. Indeed, exports are of greater significance to agriculture than to business. Total exports represent only about 4 percent of our gross national product, while agricultural exports average about 13 percent of farm commodity sales. Foreign sales are increasing for such products as soybeans and poultry. The poultry industry has been selling in foreign markets for only a few years, but these markets have already become a substantial outlet for our poultry production. There is no doubt in my mind that we could greatly expand foreign markets for poultry if the Department of Agriculture would give more assistance in helping to introduce this product in countries where it is not now available.

Again I wish to express my thanks to the committee for doing such a fine job on this bill. I know that the farmers in Arkansas and other agricultural States will be grateful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 7444) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House on the matters in disagreement between the two bodies, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL,

Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the diligence and great effort that he gave to the Senate Committee on Appropriations report on the Department of Agriculture. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, he listened to many witnesses and gave guidance and direction to the subcommittee and the full committee relating to the agriculture appropriations. This appropriations bill represents a decided improvement in funds for many of the programs of the Department of Agriculture, particularly in the field of agricultural research. We added additional moneys to the request of the administration in the field of agricultural research.

We also improved the Farmers Home Administration program. I mention this point in particular because of my long interest in the matter of farm credit, particularly farm credit for family farmers. Later on I shall present to the Senate a statement on the Farmers Home Administration in terms of a program that I believe is necessary for modern agriculture and modern family farming.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that House Resolution 304, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3, failed in passage.

The message also notified the Senate that House Resolution 305, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4, failed in passage.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 32. An act for the relief of Jeno Becsey;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Kay Addis;

S. 70. An act for the relief of Mah Ngim Hay (Joe Mah);

S. 71. An act for the relief of Mah Ngim Bell (Bill Mah);

S. 186. An act for the relief of Dr. William Kwo-wei Chen;

S. 219. An act for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma;

S. 268. An act for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo;

S. 395. An act for the relief of Fausto Lavari;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Ja Asato (Mrs. Thomas R. Asato);

S. 441. An act for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron);

S. 452. An act for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry;

S. 485. An act for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer;

S. 746. An act for the relief of Yee Mee Hong;

S. 759. An act for the relief of Sadako Suzuki Reeder;

S. 865. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Barbara Krzak;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Martha Uchacz Barras; and

S. 1093. An act for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek; and

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to 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; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that on title I of the bill Mr. FALLON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. SCHERER, and Mr. CRAMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference, and that on title II of the bill Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6765) to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1619) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6765) to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations be given permission to meet while the Senate is in session on Wednesday of this week to conduct hearings on bills to establish a Department of Urban Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has recently been holding hearings on various proposed constitutional amendments pending before that subcommittee. Among those proposals now pending are a number of resolutions proposing electoral college reform—a different method of election of President and Vice President than that now pertaining. On June 8, I appeared before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, to testify on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 12, of which I am a cosponsor with Senators MUNDT, MCCLELLAN, HRUSKA, MORTON, and BLAKLEY. Senate Joint Resolution 12 embodies what is commonly referred to as the "district plan" for the election of presidential electors in the various States. During the course of my testimony before the subcommittee, certain questions were raised which I felt deserved more elaborate discussion than was possible at that time; so I requested, and obtained, permission to file with the subcommittee a supplemental statement with reference to these questions. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my statement before the subcommittee on June 8, and also a copy of the supplemental statement which I submitted to the subcommittee, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I sincerely hope that all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives will avail themselves of the opportunity to read these statements, in order that they may better judge the issues and factors which bear on the various proposals for electoral reform.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR THURMOND BEFORE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM, JUNE 8, 1961

Surely there can be no doubt that there exists a need for a change in the constitutional provision which provides the method and process whereby a President of the United States is elected. There are those who are of the opinion that the defects in the electoral college system have existed from the very time of the adoption of the Constitution, and there also exists a substantial difference of opinion as to the manner in which the drafters of the Constitution intended that the electoral college system operate.

During the consideration of the Constitution by the various States, there is no evidence to indicate that any controversy of substance centered around the operation of the electoral college and the manner prescribed for the election of the Chief Executive of the National Government. Hamilton stated in the 68th Federalist: "The mode of appointment of the Chief Magistrate of the United States is almost the only part of the system, of any consequence, which has escaped without severe censor, or which has received the slightest mark of approbation from its opponents." History does not reveal to us whether this initial lack of criticism of the electoral college system stemmed primarily from general public approval of the prescribed method of election of a Chief Executive, or from widespread inability to perceive, with any substantial degree of clarity, the consequences of its implementation.

Defects in the system did become apparent within a very short time after the Constitution was adopted. As early as the election of 1797, it became apparent that the system was so designed as to insure a high proba-

bility that the President and Vice President would be of conflicting political philosophies. Further complications became apparent in the election of 1800 when the House of Representatives took 35 votes to decide the election between Jefferson and Burr, who had an equal number of electoral votes and each a majority of electoral votes.

The difficulties we are experiencing with the electoral college in contemporary times are not identical, however, to the difficulties experienced in those early elections. The difficulties in the early days of the Republic with the electoral college were largely eliminated by the 12th amendment adopted in 1804, which provided that the electors would designate on their ballots which candidate for whom they were voting for President and for whom they were voting for Vice President.

The weaknesses of the electoral college system with which we are confronted today are of a different nature and derive neither from an error in design of the electoral college process, nor yet from any departure from the intent of those who drafted it. The inequities and miscarriages possible today under the electoral college system are attributable to the changed circumstances to which the constitutional provision is applicable. These changed circumstances have themselves existed in substantial degree from an early date beginning with the development of national political parties as an extra-legal institution; for although the electoral college system may have been devised in full contemplation that either a formal or informal polarization of political philosophy might well result in a more or less evenly divided electorate, it is impossible to believe that the drafters of the Constitution anticipated the development of a two-party system which functions as de facto nominating machinery by which eligibility to election to the office of President is limited to two men.

The problem, then, does not arise from a basic defect in the electoral college system, nor do the weaknesses now apparent mitigate against the usefulness of the electoral college. The defects exist because we have failed to reform the process to the degree necessary to implement in practice the principles incorporated, not only in the provision of the Constitution which relates to the election of a President, but which are also incorporated in the whole cloth of the document. The changes must, therefore, take into account the practical operation of circumstances as we know them to exist, while maintaining an approach consistent with the fundamental concepts of the Constitution.

I am a cosponsor, with Senators Mundt, McClellan, Hruska, Morton, and Blakley, of Senate Joint Resolution 12. This is a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would make two simple and desirable changes regarding the election of the President and Vice President:

1. Instead of allowing the legislatures of the States a free hand in the manner of appointing presidential electors, as is now the case, Senate Joint Resolution 12 prescribes that those presidential electors in each State who correspond to Members of the House of Representatives be elected by the people in single-elector districts, established by the legislatures; and requires that these districts be composed of compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitles the State to one Representative in Congress. The two presidential electors who correspond to each State's two U.S. Senators would continue to be elected statewide.

2. Instead of allowing the House of Representatives, voting by States, to choose the President in the event no one has a majority of the electoral vote, it requires that he be chosen by a joint session of the House and Senate with each Member having one vote.

Both of these changes are limited to the forms and principles of representation of the people of the United States in choosing the President and Vice President—the forms and principles of representation which are the foundation on which rests the executive power of the National Government.

The first change compels the use in presidential elections of the same principles of representation of the States long established for the Senate and House of Representatives—the Federal principle of the Senate and the national principle of the House. The second change extends these same principles to the contingent election of a President and a Vice President by Congress, should that become necessary.

It is the Federal principle of the Constitution that gives the States, as coequal political societies, equal representation in the Senate; and it is the national principle which gives the States unequal representation in the House of Representatives according to their inequalities in population.

By retaining the office and person of the elector as a State officer performing the single Federal function of voting for President and Vice President—the two elective national officers of the United States—Senate Joint Resolution 12 does not transfer control of elections from the States to the National Government.

Abolition of the person of the presidential elector necessarily will require the establishment of some substitute for the performance of his vital function. His function, with his fellow electors, is the formal, constitutional nomination and election of the President and Vice President by a majority vote, or, if there is no majority, merely the nominations for these offices to the House and Senate, respectively. In performing his function, the elector acts in a representative capacity—an agent of the people who appointed (elected) him.

Today in each State, slates of electors are nominated under State law by political parties organized under that law. What is often overlooked is that national parties and their presidential conventions are extra-legal, being merely voluntary associations of State parties.

Party nominees for President and Vice President have no legal status as candidates for office under the Constitution or any laws of the United States. It is the office and person of presidential elector which permits the functioning of national parties without any constitutional provision. Without the elector, some constitutional provision would have to be made if the Constitution is to provide a certain means for filling the offices of President and Vice President.

The elector's elimination would create a constitutional vacuum unless some substitute is provided. Former Representative Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., of New York, has stated this problem. He was writing about a proposed amendment in 1955 that would abolish the electoral college, retain the electoral votes, and permit their proportional division among presidential candidates. He wrote:

"Most important is the constitutional vacuum in the election of the President created by the abolition of the State offices of presidential elector. For, any organic instrument of government is incomplete that fails to provide for the filling of its own offices by established and competent authority.

"The Constitution now provides imperatively that each State 'shall' appoint electors, that the electors 'shall' meet and vote and 'shall' sign and certify and transmit certificates to the President of the Senate who 'shall' open them and a person 'shall' be President. These imperative provisions will produce a President without the agency of a party nominating convention. This permits conventions to be extra-legal, and to continue so.

"Senate Joint Resolution 31 says: 'The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States,' and speaks of 'persons for whom votes were cast for President.' But, Senate Joint Resolution 31 is silent on the vital first step of who, where, when, and how shall be legally selected 'persons for whom' votes can be cast for President and Vice President. Presumably, candidates are to be named by the extra-legal, but lawful, 'national' conventions of the legal State parties. If this power is implied in Senate Joint Resolution 31, doesn't the 'national' convention become an instrument of the Constitution?

"Should an attempt be made to fill this constitutional vacuum by an addition to the proposed amendment, the foremost question is: Can nominees of national party conventions be given constitutional status without making the party conventions themselves instruments of the Constitution under the authority of Congress? If this is not possible, a whole body of Federal law would be necessary to supplant present State laws and self-made convention rules with respect to the nominating process.

"The presidential elector, a so-called 'rubberstamp,' unknown and unsung, has a constitutional importance as great as his anonymity. Senate Joint Resolution 3, by Senator MUNDT, by maintaining the office of presidential elector, avoids this and other major criticism.

"I suspect," Congressman Coudert concluded, "that few of the friends of Senate Joint Resolution 31 have looked at it in terms of a part of the Constitution, and some of its ultimate consequences on our Federal system. I fear that its immediate positive political effect has dominated most of the thought about it."

The abolition of the elector, it seems to me, raises a whole series of questions that have not even been considered by those who advocate it.

Since the last election, some highly placed people have urged that presidential electors be bound by the Constitution to vote for the presidential candidate of his party. Any attempt to do this will necessarily require constitutional status for political parties and their candidates for President and Vice President.

More important, this proposal to bind the elector by the Constitution is pure trivia. As Senator MUNDT has pointed out in his testimony, more than 14,000 presidential electors have served since 1820, and not more than 8 are alleged to have voted contrary to the wishes of their constituents. In no instance did any of these alleged vote changes affect the result. In 1948, in Tennessee, one elector voted for me even though he was on the regular Democratic slate of electors, but he was also on the States' Rights ticket and had announced before his election that he would vote for me. To seize on such infrequent and more often meaningless occurrences as a pretext for abolition of the entire electoral college system and the fundamental concepts of representation incorporated is unthinkable.

In trying to improve the Constitution, we must be most careful that we do not, knowingly or unknowingly, upset the balance of our constitutional structure. We should always remember that ours is a limited constitution of government—limited to the objects for which its powers were granted.

The Constitution of the United States rests on two fundamental principles: (1) The limited dual sovereignty of State and Nation—each has the sovereign power to declare the law as to certain things, and not as to other things, and (2) the division and separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers, according to function. On these foundation principles are erected our system of checks and balances.

In our Federal Union of States, the proper objects of government are divided between

the National Government and the governments of the several States. This is the the limited dual sovereignty of State and State, and is the source of our dual citizenship. We are, at the same time, citizens of the United States and of our own States.

It is the principle of separation of powers in the National Government which brought about the establishment of the electoral college as the election link between the States—in a federal union—and the National Government. For example, were the British to introduce a separation of powers into their unitary government, they would have to establish an elective body counterpart to the House of Commons to choose the executive. As it is, the Commons—without the separation of powers—performs the function of electoral college when it chooses the Prime Minister.

I submit, therefore, that no amendment to the Constitution with respect to the election of the President and Vice President should go further than to the manner of electing presidential electors. For, to do so will necessarily violate the basic principles on which this Nation was established.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 is carefully designed to accomplish the limited purpose of establishing for the election of the President and Vice President the same principle of representation that has been long established for the election of Members of Congress—Senators and Representatives.

Each of us, as citizens of our States and of the United States, is represented in Congress by two U.S. Senators and by one Representative. Thus, a citizen's representation in Congress is two parts Federal and one part national. Under Senate Joint Resolution 12, a citizen would be represented in the electoral college on exactly the same principles. We would vote for two Federal electors, corresponding to our Senators, and for one national elector, who would correspond to our own Representative in Congress. In so voting, each of us would be two parts Federal and one part national.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 would give the President and the Congress similar and parallel roots into the electorate. This is the proper foundation for both the executive and legislative branches of our National Government.

In our Federal union of States, we cannot correctly speak of "a majority of the American people," for we are reckoned in presidential elections on both the Federal and National principles. Nor should the Chief Executive be described as "President of all the people" or "President of the American people." He is "President of the United States," the title of the office established by the Constitution, a title which comprehends the Federal and National principles of representation of our political society.

For my part, I wish to see our Federal union of States maintained. It is, I believe, our greatest contribution to the knowledge and art of government for the protection of liberty. May I urge the committee to report Senate Joint Resolution 12 with the recommendation that it be passed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, JUNE 20, 1961

Upon the occasion of my appearance before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 12, a question was raised concerning the advisability of providing in the Constitution that each elector should be bound to support the nominees endorsed by the party on whose ticket he offered for office. When the question was raised, I stated that I thought it would be inadvisable and unnecessary, but perhaps the lesser of the evils if we should be reduced to a choice between binding the electors or abolishing the electoral college altogether.

Because of the far-reaching consequences which would flow from binding the electors to support party nominees by constitutional mandate, I would like to elaborate further and review some of the many effects that would follow such a step.

As I stated in my first appearance before the subcommittee, we must approach the question of electoral college reform in the light of existing practice, while adhering to the basic concept of the Constitution. Existing practice clearly demonstrates that there is no need to bind the electors to support nominees of a party by constitutional provision. Out of the more than 14,000 electors who have served since 1820, not more than 8 are alleged to have voted contrary to the wishes of their constituents, and in no instance did any of these alleged vote changes affect the results.

Since no miscarriage has occurred, it is proper next to examine the circumstances to determine if there is any logical reason to expect an increase in such occurrences, and whether any check exists by which their frequency can be controlled.

As a matter of practice, the candidates for elector are nominated in 47 of the 50 States by the State political parties. As of 1961, the laws of 35 States require the nomination of electors to be made by a convention of the State political party. In 10 other States, the laws provide that the electors be nominated by either the State executive committee of the political party or some other link in the party machinery. Alabama is one of those States where candidates for elector are nominated by the State party organization. Normally, the State party officers in Alabama follow the advice of a referendum in which the voters express themselves on the nomination of electors. This referendum is merely advisory, however, as is indicated by the fact that in 1952 the court upheld the right of the executive committee to refuse to certify as an elector one nominee who refused to pledge his electoral vote for the party's presidential endorsee, although the individual involved had been successful in the primary referendum. In one State—Florida—the Governor selects the candidates for presidential elector for all parties, but in practice he names those recommended by the State political parties. In Pennsylvania, which my research has revealed as the only State in which the nominee of a national political convention is accorded statutory recognition, the electors are nominated by the presidential nominee of the national convention. In practice, of course, the State political party makes the choice. In the other three States, the electors are nominated by a primary election.

In practical operation, therefore, the State political parties in 47 of the 50 States nominate the electors for their own tickets. It is inconceivable that except in the rare and infrequent instances when the State party makes a gross misjudgment in its selection of nominees for elector, that the elector would, if elected, cast his electoral vote for other than the presidential and vice presidential nominees endorsed by the State party which nominated the elector. Each of the infrequent departures by an elector from the normal procedure would have the natural effect of making the State parties more cautious in the selection of nominees for elector.

In the other three States—Arizona, Kansas and Oklahoma—the elector candidates are nominated by primary election. In these States, it is the majority of the people within the particular political party who select those in whom to repose their trust. No peculiar factors exist which would make the misplacement of a trust more likely in this selection of a person to act in a representative capacity than in any other type of election.

The laws of the great majority of States do provide means other than those above characterized for the nomination of candidates for elector by what are usually called minority parties. In most such instances, the nominations are left even more within the discretion of the parties which initiate a separate candidacy than in the case of the major parties.

It should be obvious, then, that there is no prospect of any greater frequency, if indeed as much, of an elector voting for other than the presidential and vice presidential nominees endorsed by the political organization under whose banner the elector runs in the election than in the past. The prospect of a miscarriage between the expression of a preference by the voters who elect the presidential elector, and its reflection in the electoral vote cast by the elector, is remote to the extent that it has no practical significance.

There is indeed even another assurance that it is unnecessary to include in the Constitution a provision binding the electors to cast their ballots for the nominees endorsed by the party under whose auspices the elector-nominees were placed on the ballot. The States now have the authority to require an oath from a nominee for elector to support the presidential and vice presidential nominees supported by the party which certifies his name on the ballot. Some States—Florida, for example—now require such an oath. The States, therefore, now have the power to deal with the situation in the remote possibility that it should become a problem.

To provide in the Constitution that the electors should be bound to support a particular nominee would be useless. I feel it is necessary, however, to go further and point out several of the many very dangerous potentials of such a step in view of the fact that when considering any particular proposal for new legislation, many persons adopt an attitude that the proposal might be useless and if it can do no harm, it might as well be passed to be doubly sure.

If nominees for elector are to be bound by constitutional mandate to support some particular nominee for President and Vice President in the electoral college, some specification must be written into the provision with respect to which nominee they will be bound. At this point the first and major stumbling block is reached. Nominees for President and Vice President selected by the conventions of national parties have no official status as candidates, either under the laws of the United States or the laws of the 50 States, with the possible exception of Pennsylvania. The national parties themselves are but unofficial, cooperative efforts of various State parties which have a legally recognized status individually and a quasi-official function in the political structure under the laws of their own States. It is important to recognize and acknowledge the fact that the nominees for President and Vice President are not nominated by the State parties themselves, but by the national conventions. With the exception of infrequent variances, there is no reconvening of State political parties subsequent to the nomination of national candidates at the national convention of the major political parties, and no formal action taken to ratify the nominations made at the national conventions.

In order to bind a nominee for elector to cast his vote in the electoral college for a particular nominee of a national political convention, the Constitution would have to be so modified as to include within the electoral machinery, and give legal status to, the national political parties. Such a step would inevitably give rise to both uncertainties, and to changes in our political structure to which the rare deviations of

electors from normal custom would pale in significance by comparison.

The control and regulation of elections by the several States comprises the undergirding and strength of our entire political structure. Under our existing system, the political parties of each State are regulated by State laws and are, therefore, an integral part of the election process. The national political parties must now operate through the State parties in each State in order to fulfill any goal of political activities. By this means, the several States retain almost exclusive control of the electoral process.

Were the national political parties and their conventions to be given legal recognition by the U.S. Constitution, and thereby to become an integral part of the election process by virtue of a constitutional provision binding nominees for elector in the several States to cast their votes for the nominees for President and Vice President of the national parties' conventions, control of elections would necessarily pass from the several States to the National Government. It should be quite obvious that no one State could assert jurisdiction over a national political party; and since the national party, as a part of the official electoral process, would necessarily have to be subjected to governmental control—as does any portion of the electoral process—the National Government would be the only level of Government capable of performing the requisite regulation.

This would not involve a mere change in theory, but would occasion a very serious departure in practice from the traditional operation of the electoral process. That such a departure could not be avoided is easy to demonstrate. Were the vote in the electoral college of a particular elector to be challenged as being contrary to the requirement that the vote of the elector be cast for the nominees of the national convention of a particular political party, an essential question of fact before the court, in which the challenge was made, would be the sufficiency of the nomination by the national party convention of the Presidential or Vice Presidential nominee in question. This would open the door in the judicial inquiry to reviews of question ranging from the sufficiency of determinations by the credentials committee of the convention down to and including the tabulation of delegate votes. Having brought the national parties and their nominating conventions within the jurisdiction of the courts by a constitutional provision giving official status to their deliberations and actions in the nomination of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, the Congress would find itself facing the alternative of either leaving the regulation of national political conventions to the discretion of the courts, or undertaking, itself, to legislate guidelines and minimum requirements and safeguards for the conduct of both the parties and their conventions.

I cannot believe that the Congress is yet willing to propose either to transfer the power to control elections from the States to the National Government, nor to have the National Government interfere in the operation of national political parties and their conventions. Such a step would not only be an unthinkable stride toward centralization of power in the National Government, but would also insure a degree or rigidity in our national political activities which would contradict the principles of political liberty on which our country was founded.

As I stated in my previous testimony before the committee, it might well be that to bind electors to particular presidential and vice presidential nominees is a lesser evil than an outright abolition of the electoral college and the office of elector. Upon reflection, it would be difficult for me to make a choice between these evils. Fortunately, there is no need to make such a choice, for neither has there been any ill effects from the discretion allowed under the Constitution to the presidential electors, nor is there any prospect that such discretion may create a problem in the future. As I have pointed out, occasions where electors deviated from the normal course of procedure in casting their electoral votes have been extremely rare; and each such infrequent occasion lessens the likelihood of its recurrence. Additionally, each State itself has the power to bind the elector, and some States have seen fit to exercise this power. If such a power is to exist, it should by all means be left to the States.

There is one other matter upon which I would like to comment briefly. It has been suggested to the subcommittee that under the district plan, proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 12, the personality and popularity of individual presidential elector-nominees might become a factor in the presidential election to an extent that it is not under our present system. Such a suggestion, I submit, is illogical and is refuted by practical experience under our existing presidential electoral system.

A number of States now require that all but two of the nominees for elector reside each in a particular congressional district. This requirement prevails in Louisiana, for instance, and is practiced in my own State of South Carolina. The fact that an influential and popular person is a nominee for elector has, under the existing system, no more influence than an active and vigorous participation in the campaign by the same individual would have, even were he not an elector.

I would also call to the attention of the subcommittee the fact that in no less than 30 of the 50 States, the names of the presidential electors do not even appear on the ballot. There is nothing in the plan proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 12 which would require a change in the laws of the several States which prescribe that the names of the nominees for elector not be on the ballot.

In addition to the 30 States which do not now place the names of the electors on the ballot, there is another State which does not print the names of the electors on the ballots which are used in voting machines. This State, incidentally, is New York, from the Senator of which came the suggestion that the personality and popularity of the electors might, under the district plan, influence the electorate.

OPPOSITION TO THE OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of June 15 appeared an editorial entitled "House Without Foundation."

This excellent editorial clearly points out the excesses and impracticalities of the omnibus housing bill recently passed by the Senate, and now pending in the House Banking and Currency Committee. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal is, of course, a conservative newspaper. In view of the scathing denunciation of the housing bill set forth in the editorial, it is obvious that the Wall Street Journal has allowed its conservatism to prevail in this cautious editorial. This is aptly illustrated by the fact that the editorial conservatively estimates the cost of the housing bill passed by the Senate at "more than $6.1 billion," whereas simple arithmetic proves conclusively that the cost estimate is a good 30 percent below reality, for the cost in fact exceeds $9 billion.

At a time when fiscal responsibility is more imperative than ever before in our history, this bill demonstrates that both the administration and the Senate are rising to new heights of fiscal irresponsibility. Let us hope that for the good of the country the other body will demonstrate the prudence which is lacking in the Senate and executive branch, and will reject this housing bill.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Wall Street Journal, June 15, 1961]

HOUSE WITHOUT FOUNDATION

So many things are wrong with the housing bill in Congress that it would be impossible to catalog them here. But if there is a word that sums up these proposals, it is irresponsibility.

The version passed by the Senate this week, incorporating most of President Kennedy's requests, would cost more than $6.1 billion which a debt and deficit-ridden Government obviously cannot afford. In some respects the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, with its 40-odd amendments, is even more reckless.

One of these amendments would more than double, to over $1.5 billion, the administration's request for the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance fund. Another amendment would boost from $50 million to $650 million the administration's request for community facilities. The House committee's minority report calls this provision, among other things, a needless federalization of municipal finance.

But the provision which seems to us to set the tone of the bill as a whole is the key one concerning housing for families of modest incomes; that is, in the $4,000- to $6,000-a-year range. The White House asked Federal Housing Administration insurance of 40-year mortgages, with no downpayment, on homes costing up to $15,000. The Senate finally stuck in a token downpayment requirement, but even this small sop to responsibility may well disappear before the bill becomes law.

Certainly a case can be made that the community should try to provide tolerable housing for the truly indigent, despite the considerable abuses associated with public housing in practice. But when it comes to this sort of assistance for people of moderate incomes, we are leaving the standards of prudence far behind.

By definition, people of moderate incomes do not need public assistance. What the Government is in effect saying with this proposal is that if such a family does not have exactly the house of its heart's desire, it is the duty of Government to help provide that house. That is a concept of Government which has no place in any system short of socialism.

Consider, moreover, the demoralizing implications of the aid. One of the soundest principles of homeownership is that the buyer have an equity in his property; this is abandoned in the administration proposal. The authorization of 40-year mortgages is no less flagrant a departure from prudent lending procedures; on that basis, to mention just one objection, it has been estimated that the $15,000 home would cost the borrower something like $38,000 before he owned it, if it or he lasted that long.

To call such proposals by the name of assistance is to debase the language; they are nothing but an invitation to folly. Unfortunately that approach is typical of the whole bill.

For what is the broad housing problem this bill is supposed to remedy? Certainly

this country is not up against a general housing shortage requiring the slam-bang measures of desperation in this catchall bill. There is increasing evidence that housing is catching up with demand; in some places, plain evidence of overbuilding and excessive speculation. Into this market the Government proposes to pour new billions for everything from public housing to farm and college housing. The one clearly discernible effect would be massive new inflation of a market in no need of stimulus.

And what is the fiscal background against which these huge new expenditures must be viewed? It is that of a Government increasing its spending for all conceivable domestic, military and foreign programs, of a Government plunging ever deeper into deficits and debt. Even if the housing bill were otherwise desirable, it would not do in such circumstances. As the House committee minority puts it, the "overriding issue in this housing bill * * * is the issue of fiscal responsibility. The bill contains excessive budget spending authorizations. The bill contains unsound and unnecessary provisions."

We are not sure it is still possible to hope that some wisdom will be instilled into this measure. But as it is, the country ought to know that the administration and Congress are heedlessly slapping together a house without foundation.

THE SO-CALLED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMITTEE IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for a number of years there has been an increasing tendency for the executive branch of the National Government to usurp legislative functions delegated to the Congress. One of the most extreme ventures in furtherance of the trend is exemplified by Executive Order No. 10925, issued by the President on March 6, 1961, and the subsequent actions of the committee appointed by the President to implement this Executive order.

This Executive action contemplates the incorporation into each Government contract of a six-point plan which includes:

1. An agreement that affirmative action will be taken to employ applicants and treat employees without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin; to display posters prescribed by the Government in conspicuous places setting forth this policy;

2. An agreement to state in all solicitations and advertisements for employees that all qualified applicants will receive consideration without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin;

3. An agreement to notify any workers' representatives of the agreements made, and to post appropriate notices of the fact;

4. An agreement to comply with all provisions of the Executive order, and with all rules, regulations, and relevant orders of the committee established by the order;

5. An agreement to furnish all information and reports required by the order or rules, regulations and orders of the committee, and to permit access to all books, records, and accounts by the committee and the contracting agency;

6. An agreement to secure from each subcontractor or vendor an agreement to abide the points outlined here, plus, an agreement to take whatever action against any subcontractor or vendor that the Government contracting agency directs—including cancellation of business dealings with him.

Mr. President, as is obvious from the reading of it, this Executive order contemplates conditioning Government purchase contracts on compliance with terms that go far beyond anything necessary to orderly and economic administration of purchases authorized and appropriated for by the Congress.

Congress, according to judicial decisions, has rather broad discretion to condition purchases by the Government. Congress has not, however, authorized the executive branch to undertake a broad reform of our social structure by the use of arm-twisting tactics in letting Government contracts.

Many far-reaching consequences fall within the legislative prerogatives included in this Executive order. Presumably, it applies only to domestic procurement; and, therefore, when the specified conditions are not met by the domestic suppliers, acquisition will be made from foreign suppliers, without requiring the same conditions to be met by the foreign suppliers.

Mr. President, the rules and regulations for the implementation of this Executive order are in the process of being framed by a subcommittee composed of nonofficial members, or to put it bluntly, men who are not officeholders, nor subject in their appointments to confirmation by the Senate. There are serious questions as to whether the procedure being followed for the implementation of this Executive order complies with the procedural due process guarantees of the U.S. Constitution. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the committee appointed to implement Executive Order No. 10925 is in the process of holding hearings to take testimony on proposals for procedural regulations by which this Executive order shall be implemented. On June 15, Mr. Arthur Erwin, representing the Spartanburg Development Association, presented a splendidly analytical protest to the subcommittee which clearly outlines the departure from the separation-of-powers doctrine which prevails in the structure of our National Government. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Erwin be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives will read this statement so that they may be aware of the gross and unjustifiable usurpation by the Executive of powers which are the exclusive responsibility and authority of the legislative branch of the National Government.

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

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR ERWIN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, SPARTANBURG DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, SPARTANBURG, S.C., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING COMMENTS ON THE ADOPTION OF RULES AND REGULATIONS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10925, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 15, 1961

My name is Arthur Erwin. I am executive secretary of Spartanburg Development Association—an association of individuals residing in, and firms doing business in, Spartanburg County, S.C.—formed to promote the sound industrial development of the county.

Our interest in this hearing is prompted by the fact that members of our association are manufacturers and suppliers whose normal business activities may well bring them within the broad scope of Executive Order No. 10925 of March 6, 1961, as contractors, subcontractors, or vendors, as these terms are used in the order.

I do not feel that I should proceed without registering a strong protest with respect to the limited period of time that was provided for the study of these proposals, the preparation of a presentation, and the making of plans to be present here. The procedure evidences a complete disregard for the problems encountered in preparing comments for a hearing of this sort, especially as to those who are in areas away from Washington who will be affected by, and who have an interest in the proposals being discussed. It is my firm belief that in order for this to be a fair hearing, it should be continued at a later date so as to permit all concerned to give adequate study to the proposals and their many ramifications. I formally make this request now, and ask that it be ruled on.

As we understand the order, it requires that contractors, subcontractors, and vendors providing goods or services used or to be used in the performance of any Government contract with certain limited exceptions shall—as a condition of securing such contract, or as a condition of furnishing such goods or services—be forced to agree to abide by a prescribed six-point plan which includes:

1. An agreement that affirmative action will be taken to employ applicants and treat employees without regard to race, creed, color or national origin; to display posters prescribed by the Government in conspicuous places setting forth this policy;

2. An agreement to state in all solicitations and advertisements for employees that all qualified applicants will receive consideration without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin;

3. An agreement to notify any workers representatives of the agreements made, and to post appropriate notices of the fact;

4. An agreement to comply with all provisions of the Executive order, and with all rules, regulations, and relevant orders of the committee established by the order;

5. An agreement to furnish all information and reports required by the order or rules, regulations, and orders of the committee, and to permit access to all books, records, and accounts by the committee and the contracting agency;

6. An agreement to secure from each subcontractor or vendor an agreement to abide the points outlined here, plus an agreement to take whatever action against any subcontractor or vendor that the Government contracting agency directs—including cancellation of business dealings with him.

As we view the order and the proposed rules and regulations of the Committee, we see a tremendous bureaucracy in the making which will hold the power of life and death over much of the industrial might of this country. This bureaucracy, mind you, is not fashioned through the normal legislative process by the representatives of the people, nor is this bureaucracy subject to review by the judicial arm of our Government. It is fashioned by Executive order, is to be administered by a Committee selected by the executive department, which Committee may extract promises at will from those who would do business with the Federal Government, and which, by the threat of the application of sanctions, or by the actual application of sanctions can dominate the entire operation of firms doing business with the Federal Government.

By securing agreements from contractors that they will police the activities of their subcontractors and suppliers, the power of the Committee could easily extend to virtually every employer in the United States.

In all practical effect, this is a national law. And, nowhere in this entire scheme of operation is there a semblance of the employment of the traditional checks and balances which form our system of government. Instead, the Committee is empowered to act as rulemaker, investigator, prosecutor, jury and judge, and to operate under undisclosed standards with respect to rules of evidence and undisclosed rules with respect to burden of proof.

Woe to the businessman or industry leader whose personality or view might clash with that of an influential member of the Committee, or with that of the Committee's chief executive officer. By the same token, those who would curry favor with the Committee or its chief executive, could be placed in a favorable position with respect to Government business. The power of the Committee and its chief executive is that great.

This statement is made not as an indictment against any member of the Committee, and certainly not as an indictment of its chief executive officer, but it is made to emphasize that we in the United States believe in a system based on the soundness of laws—not a system based on the frailties of men.

At this critical time when every action of our Government is apparently being weighed as to how it will affect our "image" abroad, does not this offer an excellent opportunity to demonstrate how a balanced system of representative government operates? Why not utilize the legislative, the executive, and the judicial arms of our Government in this instance? The picture of this Committee—despite its high aims—operating under the conditions outlined here would not be a pretty picture, nor a realistic picture, for the rest of the world to see as an example of how a republic operates.

It is most unfortunate that neither the Executive order, nor the proposed rules and regulations, cite specific statutory authority for their issuance. The primary test for the validity of the scope and content of specific rules and regulations issued by administrative agencies is the measurement of whether they conform to the authority granted to the agency by Congress.

According to legal precedent, the rule is that if the administrative action exceeds the authority granted by Congress, the agency is in effect usurping the legislative power. It must stay within its statutory authority. This is a constitutional requirement with which even the President must comply. Failure to do so is a violation of due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

When, however, administrative action is taken that is within statutory authority, and otherwise meets the requirements of due process, even the judiciary cannot interfere, since to do so would result in judicial usurpation of the legislative power in violation of the separation of powers.

Thus, despite the fact that so much depends on what statutory authority the President acted in issuing Executive Order No. 10925, and on what statutory authority the committee now acts in developing rules and regulations for its operation, we are forced to speculate as to precisely where the authority lies.

We speculate that the President and the Committee may feel that the Supreme Court approved action of the nature contained in the Executive order when it decided *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.* (310 U.S. 113, on April 29, 1940).

There, a group of steel companies protested against an administrative wage determination, made by the Secretary of Labor which would be applicable to Government contractors, and which was authorized by the Walsh-Healey Act. The Supreme Court decided that the companies in that instance had no standing to sue—basing its holding on reasons deeply rooted in the constitutional divisions of authority in our system of government.

The Supreme Court, in effect, decided that the action of the Secretary of Labor was within the statutory authority granted in the Walsh-Healey Act, and that should the judiciary interfere where not authorized, it would result in usurping the legislative power in violation of the separation of powers.

The important feature for our purposes here is that there was express authority by Congress for the action of the Secretary in the *Lukens* case.

The same is not true of the Executive order and the proposals being discussed today. The development and application of these rules and regulations by you and your committee constitutes a usurping of the legislative power, which is forbidden by the Constitution.

Another important fact about the *Lukens* case that the Court clearly says that questions on supplying the needs of Government are rightfully decided by Congress. The Court said:

"The Government can supply its needs by its own manufacturing or by purchase. And Congress can as it always has, either do the purchasing of the Government's goods and supplies itself, or it can entrust its agents with final power to do so and make these agents responsible only to it."

The wisdom of developing these matters through legislation rather than executive edict is emphasized in another manner in this instance. Even though Congress did initially give authority in the Walsh-Healey Act to its "agents" to act and to answer only to Congress the legislative policy in this regard was reversed subsequently when the act was amended to permit a review of the wage determinations and to permit judicial review of legal questions, notwithstanding any stipulations that may have been extracted from the contractor by the Government. Thus, we view this effort to achieve the desired good through executive action as unwise, as well as unconstitutional.

We suggest that the proper manner to secure the ends sought here is to seek legislation authorizing the executive action that is about to be undertaken, and to provide as is provided in the Walsh-Healey Act, a procedure for full judicial review of such executive action—thus permitting each department of Government to play its part in the proper formation and proper execution of Government policy.

We are of the firm opinion that issuance of this Executive order with its many ramifications is unwise. And, we just as firmly believe that it will ultimately be found to be a usurpation of the legislative power and declared to be of no effect.

We urge that the Committee recommend to the executive department that its position with respect to content of Executive Order 10925 be reexamined. The executive department can make real and substantial progress in this area—as has been done previously—through methods not involving the compulsory features of the present order. At the same time the Executive can request legislation, if it is deemed necessary, to authorize specific sanctions and penalties.

We make a sincere request that you give this recommendation ample study and thought.

Meanwhile, other problems will arise here. For a contractor to do business under the conditions provided, there will unquestionably be added costs, and added risks. Prices must be raised to offset the added risks and costs involved in dealing with, and policing his subcontractor and suppliers, for example. And, should the contractor become involved in litigation with a subcontractor or a vendor as a result of action taken by him under the dictates of the contracting officer, the contractor must still extricate himself—the United States will enter the suit to protect the interests of the United States, not those of the contractor. Thus, another added cost.

We predict that there are many firms who will decide that they can better do without Government contract work if it means additional risks, additional costs, higher prices, and the odius control that will accompany Government contract work in the future.

What would happen if a substantial portion of some industry took this view—say a portion large enough to affect the availability of some item needed by the Government?

I presume that the contracting agency would turn to foreign suppliers who would not be bound by the same rules and regulations that bind domestic manufacturers.

We see no earthly reason why a foreign firm should stand in a superior position to a domestic firm with respect to furnishing goods or services to be used in the performance of government contracts. It may be true that the Government of the United States should not attempt to set labor standards in foreign countries. But, reflecting on the thought that these provisions are stated to be mere terms of a contract, the obligations of which are assumed as a condition of being accepted as a contractor, we see no reason why foreign firms should not be required to compete on equal terms with domestic firms for this business.

Notably absent in the rules and regulations are the standards to be used in deciding questions of fact in investigations by the contracting agencies and by the Committee. Also, conspicuous by their absence are rules for sustaining the burden of proof. It is inevitable that there will be conflicting accounts as to the actions taken by parties concerned. There must be some settled standard to decide—if it can be done in this manner—the questions of fact that arise. And, in like manner, there must be set rules as to who will carry the burden of proof. In this respect—and I say this in all seriousness—the provisions of section 301 of the Executive order appear to assume a contractor is guilty until he proves himself innocent. Establishment of standards for at least these two important features is an absolute necessity.

It would be much more satisfactory to all concerned in the investigation of a complaint if the contractor were to be furnished with a copy of the complaint at the time that such a complaint is filed. It is not foreign to our system of justice that the so-called accused be served with a copy of the accusation made against him. We suggest that this be made a requirement in proceedings following the filing of a complaint.

We suggest, also, that in those cases where the contracting agency has found an apparent violation and settlement by conciliatory means has failed it be made mandatory for the contractor to be provided opportunity for a hearing by the contracting agency prior to the time that it reports its findings and recommendations to the executive vice chairman.

It is important that at every level where findings and recommendations are made that the contractor have an opportunity to appear and rebut the findings, if he desires to do so—in other words that he have an opportunity to defend himself before any person at any level where a finding of fact is being made.

Finally, the provision required in the Government contract by section 301 of the order and 60-129 at the proposed rules and regulations with respect to permitting access to books, records, and accounts is unwarranted and obnoxious.

We predict that "fishing expeditions" into the books and records of firms in the United States will be a favorite pastime for Government contracting agencies, employees of

the Department of Labor, and representatives of the Committee.

As the proposal stands, all that will be necessary for a "fishing" license will be one complaint from an employee, or even an applicant for employment and an employer's books, records, and accounts will be virtually open to the public. This is grossly unfair. Any such procedure should be surrounded with safeguards sufficient to protect a contractor against such "fishing expeditions."

In summary, let me repeat: We see Executive Order No. 10925 and the rules and regulations that you are developing here today as creating a vast bureaucracy, which will not have been created under, and which is not intended to operate under the traditional checks and balances of our system of government.

We see this powerful force created as one that will eventually dominate virtually every industry of significant size in the United States.

We believe that if restrictive measures are necessary for carrying out the purposes of the order that they should be embodied in legislation enacted by Congress—that the present Executive order and the regulations being discussed here today exceed the authority of the executive department of our Government.

Real and substantial progress has been made in this area in the past without the compulsions contained in the present order. We urge that you recommend to the executive department that it reconsider its position with respect to the order.

We see inequities and omissions in the proposed rules and regulations—for example, placing a foreign contractor in a position superior to that of a domestic contractor with respect to Government contracts—the absence of any mention as to what rules of evidence and as to what rules with respect to burden of proof will be employed by the hearings contemplated in the order and the proposals—the danger of "fishing expeditions" into the books, records, and accounts of private firms by a multitude of Government as well as civilian personnel.

We believe the proper manner to secure the ends desired is to seek action by the legislative arm of our Government to authorize the action needed by the executive arm and make all action of the executive in this respect subject to full judicial review. In this manner the three important arms of our Government can work together in the proper development and proper administration of Government policy.

MANAGEMENT OF SENATE RESTAURANTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 398, Senate Joint Resolution 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 106) transferring the management of the Senate Restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the joint resolution been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to its consideration has been agreed to. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with this resolution, I have discussed it with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the distinguished majority leader. This proposal has been in the making for a considerable time. What it does is to transfer the management of the restaurants to the Architect, under limitations, and under supervision by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JORDAN. That is correct, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective August 1, 1961, the management of the Senate Restaurants and all matters connected therewith, heretofore under the direction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, shall be under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol under such rules and regulations as the Architect may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said restaurants by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration as to matters of general policy: *Provided,* That the management of the Senate Restaurants by the Architect of the Capitol shall cease and the restaurants revert from the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration upon adoption by that committee of a resolution ordering such transfer of jurisdiction at any time hereafter.

SEC. 2. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration after the close of business July 31, 1961, is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol all accounts, records, supplies, equipment, and assets of the Senate Restaurants that may be in the possession or under the control of the said committee in order that all such items may be available to the Architect of the Capitol toward the maintenance and operation of the Senate Restaurants.

SEC. 3. The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to carry into effect for the United States Senate the provisions of this Act and to exercise the authorities contained herein, and any resolution of the Senate amendatory hereof or supplementary hereto hereafter adopted. Such authority and direction shall continue until the United States Senate shall by resolution otherwise order, or until the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall by resolution order the restaurants to be returned to the committee's jurisdiction.

SEC. 4. There is hereby established with the Treasurer of the United States a special deposit account in the name of the Architect of the Capitol for the United States Senate Restaurants, into which shall be deposited all sums received pursuant to this Act or any amendatory or supplementary resolutions hereafter adopted and from the operations thereunder and from which shall be disbursed the sums necessary in connection with the exercise of the duties required under this Act or any amendatory or supplementary resolutions and the operations thereunder. Any amounts hereafter appropriated from the Treasury of the United States for such restaurant shall be a part of the appropriation "Contingent Expenses of the Senate", for the particular fiscal year involved and each such part shall be paid to the Architect of the Capitol by the Secretary of the Senate in such sum as such appropriation or appropriations shall hereafter specify and shall be deposited by such Architect in full under such special deposit account.

SEC. 5. Deposits and disbursements under such special deposit account (1) shall be made by the Architect, or, when directed by him, by such employees of the Architect as he may designate, and (2) shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may direct: *Provided,* That payments made by or under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol from such special deposit account shall be conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SEC. 6. The Architect, Assistant Architect, and any employees of the Architect designated by the Architect under section 5 hereof shall each give bond in the sum of $5,000 with such surety as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve for the handling of the financial transactions under such special deposit account.

SEC. 7. This Act shall supersede any other Acts or resolutions heretofore approved for the maintenance and operation of the Senate Restaurants: *Provided, however,* That any Acts or resolutions now in effect shall again become effective, should the restaurants at any future time revert to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 366, Senate Resolution 148.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 148) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A number of Senators may want to be heard on the resolution, and I am certain action cannot be completed on it tonight. So I thought perhaps if the Senate continued until some time just before 6 o'clock, and then went over until tomorrow, we could resume at that time, and, if there is some intention of securing a limitation of time agreement, I do not believe the majority leader will have any difficulty in that respect tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be perfectly agreeable with me. With that statement in mind, we will proceed until approximately 6 o'clock in debate on the reorganization plan, and I shall try to agree upon a time limitation at the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under those circumstances, I believe the majority leader can assure Members of the Senate there will be no yea-and-nay votes tonight.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, there will be no votes tonight, only debate, and no request for a limitation of time will be made tonight, but it will be made some time tomorrow, when consideration of the resolution is resumed, after the morning hour. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is that satisfactory to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I wanted to be sure what the understanding was.

Mr. JAVITS. I wanted to be sure it was satisfactory to the chairman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to make the record clear.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

In the pattern of reorganization plans which have been submitted to the Congress by the White House we find a definite design to tie the Commission Chairmen closer to the President, who has the appointive power.

This obvious power-seeking device is not, however, the principal objection I have to the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1, which was reported to the Senate without recommendation by the Committee on Government Operations.

In fact, that committee suggested in its report that the plan should be carefully studied by all Members of the Senate. This suggestion is an ominous warning that the provisions of the reorganization plan might not be favorable in their entirety.

Senate Members will note the three points raised in the committee report conclusions: One, that the plan would authorize the delegation by the Commission of any and all of its functions to subordinates; two, that the plan would provide only for a discretionary right of review which, if denied, would result in the action of the subordinate being final; and three, it would vest in the Chairman of the Commission authority to choose the individuals who would exercise the delegated power.

At this point I want it to be perfectly clear that in my opposition to this plan I bear no feeling whatsoever that the present members of the Securities and Exchange Commission would, in any way, permit the conduct of SEC business to rest at any level except that of fairness and proficiency.

In fact, this feeling I have of utmost confidence in the members of that Commission adds to the reasons I have for contending the reorganization plan, as proposed, is not required.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am the ranking Republican member, conducted hearings on the reorganization plan at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. Our committee made no formal recommendations to the Government Operations Committee, another indication of a lack of solid feeling that the plan is desirable or necessary.

In those hearings, I believe Mr. G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, hit on a very vital point in his opposition to the plan when he said: "I want to repeat that we do not believe rulemaking authority and the power to put people out of business should be subject to delegation."

I heartily concur with Mr. Funston's opinion.

Dr. William L. Cary, Chairman of the SEC, is a man for whom I hold great respect. He did not, in his testimony, present an argument which would be convincing that all of the powers contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1 were considered by him as a "must" package for changing SEC functions.

Quite the contrary, Dr. Cary gave firm testimony that the delegation of powers would necessarily require careful attention by the Commission. He said: "Mr. Funston was quite correct this morning in indicating what I previously have stated, and I now reaffirm, that we do not plan a delegation of our general rulemaking."

In this statement Dr. Cary obviously clearly recognizes a most serious weakness in the reorganization plan. If the Commission has no idea of such delegation, then why was the reorganization plan submitted to the Congress containing provisions for such delegation?

I submit that Dr. Cary doubtlessly was speaking the judgment of the existing members of the Commission, but, with those powers in the law, what might happen if others were serving on the Commission?

The Congress is left in the same unfortunate position by the testimony of Dean James M. Landis, special assistant to the President, who recommended the reorganization plan and apparently dictated its terms.

Dean Landis also told the committee that he could foresee no delegation of major rulemaking power to subordinates regardless of the provisions of the plan, but in the next breath he admitted the authority to do so is contained in the plan.

Again we find that the Congress is being called upon to have trust, not only in the existing Commission members, but in Commission members not yet known to the Congress, that the delegation authority will not be used to whatever extremes the Commission might desire.

We have witnessed a growing tendency in the last several decades to concentrate more and more power in a centralized Government in Washington and, now, we are experiencing the first steps to concentrate that centralized Government power into the hands of the President through his absolute control of the functions of Commissions by the appointive power of their Chairmen.

PROPOSED DISCONTINUATION OF PRODUCTION OF MANNED STRATEGIC BOMBERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to address some remarks to the question of proposed discontinuation of the production of manned strategic bombers, as reflected in the budget presentation of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1962. I wish to aline myself wholeheartedly in support of the action of both U.S. Congressional Committees on Armed Services in providing appropriation authorization for this much-needed procurement. The deep-rooted wisdom of the Congress in such matters has proved itself many times in the past, and I sincerely hope that this action will cause reconsideration and a more thorough study of the problem by the Secretary of Defense before he allows this Nation to lose the priceless asset of the time and battle-proved flexibility, not only of the strategic deterrent capability of manned strategic bombers but their offensive might as well.

The B–58 is the only supersonic manned bomber in the free world. The proposal of the Secretary of Defense to discontinue procurement of the B–58, the only supersonic manned bomber in the free world, is the subject to which I address my remarks.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on April 5, 1961, which is recorded on page 95 of the report of those hearings, Secretary McNamara stated that if subsequent events should dictate the restart of production lines after a lapse of 12 to 18 months, the cost would be in the order of $300 million and "there would be hiatus between termination and the start of deliveries approximating 24 months."

The Secretary was asked what would happen if we needed these bombers and we stopped production now, with the production lines going. It has cost a great deal to get the two wings we have. With the production going we could provide the third wing at a minimal cost. The Secretary said it would cost $300 million to start the production lines again, if we stopped them, but that "there would be a hiatus between termination and the start of deliveries approximating 24 months."

But, would our potential adversary afford us the luxury of 24 months to regain our stature?

On the contrary, Mr. President, prudence would dictate that we spend this same $300 million to procure long-range supersonic B–58 bombers and thus provide for continuity, allow exploitation of growth potential, enhance our deterrent posture immediately, and above all avoid hiatus and loss of irretrievable time.

Mr. President, there are three Senators who have flown the B–58, though there is only one general in the Pentagon who has done so. I have been assured by the proper authorities that there is only one general in the Pentagon who has flown the B–58, but three of our colleagues in the Senate have flown it. I hope Senators will talk to Members of this body who have flown the B–58, who say it is the "hottest" plane in the air.

The supersonic B–58 airplane is the product of the technical ingenuity of the Fort Worth division of General Dynamics Corp. The suppliers of its various components and subsystems cover virtually every State of the Union, but the concept and the statement of specifications come from the technical team of this great company.

The B–58 represents one of the greatest technological jumps in manned strategic bombers that has been demonstrated and proved in the free world today. This supersonic bomber development is an area in which we appear to excel the Soviets. The technical team that produces this airplane represents a very real and vitally important national asset.

I should like to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from Aviation Week of June 12, 1961, entitled "New Image at Paris." The

editorial sets out how this is the one field in which we excel the Soviets, and how the Soviet observers gave much attention to the B–58 at the Paris airshow. It is the one plane which seemed to worry the Soviets, judging from the time they spent observing it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and articles from Aviation Week be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from virtually every source imaginable, alarm is expressed at the growing technical capability of the Soviet and the necessity that we match and surpass this growth.

Mr. Khrushchev makes his boasts of future world domination; he has bragged about his goals in his recent talks with President Kennedy in Vienna. It is up to us in America, in this generation, in this decade, in this Congress, here and now, to see that we, not they, hold the rein of the future.

The whole character of the Southwest has undergone a gradual change during the last 20 years. Prior to this, the economy of this area was largely extractive from mineral resources and from agricultural production. The character of the colleges and universities of the South and Southwest reflected this. With the establishment of aeronautical business in this area, a gradual and subtle change in this situation has taken place.

Associated industries such as electronics, and so forth, have sprung up and taken root to the end that many major and significant contributions have already been made in the fields of aerospace, propulsion, electronics, nucleonics, guidance and control.

Basic contributions in all of the physical sciences are now coming from the Southwest and South.

The Fort Worth division of General Dynamics has been a major contributor to this general pattern. They have wholeheartedly joined the community and served as a focal point and stimulus in tapping the unused resources of this great area. They have aided in the training a teams of highly competent technical manpower. They have enhanced to a large and marked degree the technical resources of our colleges and universities.

I would like to illustrate my point with a few examples. Encouraged by the management of General Dynamics, Fort Worth—

First. Thirty-three engineering and scientific employees of the company now serve as part-time instructors in nearby technical schools.

Second. Skilled presentation teams have been trained and are available to student groups in the Southwest.

Third. Engineering teaching awards are presented annually to nominated members of the faculties of engineering schools in the Texas area.

Fourth. Teaching excellence awards are presented annually to the faculties of high schools and junior high schools.

Fifth. With the consent and encouragement of the management, 15 valued employees have left to become permanent members of engineering faculties of local institutions of higher learning.

Sixth. Four former employees are now serving as heads of their respective departments and one is the President of Arlington State College, Arlington, Tex.

Seventh. Six scholarships are awarded annually.

Eighth. Six fellowships for the attainment of graduate degrees are awarded annually.

In 1959, the engineering group of the Fort Worth division of General Dynamics had built up to a total of 2,900 people of at least baccalaureate level. Of these, 56 had Ph. D. degrees and 304 have attained masters degrees.

But, Mr. President, a decline has set in. The engineering force now numbers 2,109 B.S. or better, of which 34 are Ph. D.'s and 354 masters degree. If the supersonic B–58 program is allowed to die as proposed, this invaluable national asset of trained manpower will be lost.

Can we as a nation afford this extravagance? I do not propose to let the facts go unstated. We appear to have a lack of distribution and disproportionate concentration of our technical talent in this Nation; as one yardstick, I will quote a most recent statistic for a scholastic year:

Scholastic year 1957–58

Numbers of Ph. D.'s graduated per year per million of population:	
Eastern United States	100
Midwestern United States	70
Southwestern United States	25

This summary data illustrates the vital need to keep these teams of highly qualified personnel geographically distributed in the United States. A vital area is the great Southwest. Defense plants must be located in safe areas and be distributed rather than concentrated.

The whole character of the Southwest has undergone a gradual change during the last 20 years, with diffusion of industry, particularly of the aircraft industry into the southwest part of the country and on to the west coast in California. The development of this potential for the production of these magnificent speed vehicles is a great value the country should not disperse at this time, and then try to reclaim at a later time and a much greater expense.

If the supersonic B–58 weapons system program is ruthlessly cut off, this invaluable reservoir of highly trained personnel, as a team, will be lost to the United States. Furthermore, a vital sinew of American defense will be severed, perhaps beyond recovery or repair.

What are the alternatives? It has been stated several times that there does not seem to be any imperative current requirement for these airplanes by the Air Force. But the people who fly these airplanes state, without reservation, that they are the only strategic airplanes which can effectively penetrate Soviet defenses and deliver their warheads reliably and accurately. They base their statements on their personal experience in tests run against our own air defenses. How can they be rebutted by members of the air staff who have not talked with them nor seen, ridden in, or flown these airplanes themselves?

The so-called experts who say, "You cannot do it" have not flown the planes, yet three Senators have flown the planes as pilots.

We are told that the war games show that the B–58 is less desirable than the B–52. That was based on computed radar visibility, not an actual test.

Radar visibility is an important factor in assessing the vulnerability of an aircraft. Yet, I am advised that much war gaming has been done using an assumed radar visibility number for the B–58 as much as four times the value measured in recent actual tests. This erroneous assumption robs the supersonic B–58 of one of its real advantages—in war games—but not in real war.

This is not intended to discount the very great value of the war game technique; however, it does illustrate how assumptions can control the conclusions and how, perhaps inadvertently, one erroneous assumption has acted to discount one important aspect of the unique configuration and performance of the B–58.

The ability of the manned bomber to exercise intelligent evasive maneuvers, employ tactics, and operate successfully around subsystem failures; to seek out and destroy targets either unknown or of unknown location is the basis for the case for the retention of manned bombers from now on.

The unguided missiles cannot do so. They do not have the intelligence to undertake evasive action, to seek out new targets if they find one gone, or change their course to hunt up another target. Only the manned bomber can do so.

I point out that the plane can travel more than 1,300 miles an hour. It travels at more than twice the speed of sound.

I have a globe in the Chamber with ribbons on it. The red ribbons illustrate how far the plane can fly without refueling. It has been said that the plane is not feasible because it has a short range. The red ribbons illustrate that the B–58 could take off from West Germany, cross the southern part of Russia, India, and land in Burma without refueling. The B–58 could take off in England, cross the northern part of the Soviet Union and make its way to the Sea of Japan without refueling. With one refueling, it could take off at Chicago, cross the top of the globe, cross Russia, and land in India.

We have spent already $2 billion to make planes to refuel the B–52. Those same refueling planes could refuel the B–58.

It has been said that the need will be served by the Polaris submarine. I believe that the Polaris submarine is a great deterrent weapon but, after all, when the Polaris submarine is at its home base, it cannot strike. The B–58 can strike from its home base at any time. There are 766 bases in the free world suitable for the dispersion of these planes. They can be dispersed.

The plane is small, much smaller than the B–52. It can be run back into a mountain side, where it is relatively easy to bore holes, and the plane can be protected there. When a Polaris submarine goes out on a patrol, it fires a missile but it does not know whether the missile strikes its mark and, if so, what damage has been done. A manned bomber has a crew which can see what it is doing. It has visibility. It carries multiple loads, and the crew can see what damage is wrought.

Of equal importance is the ability of the manned bomber to observe the results of his strike and either release another weapon, proceed to destroy other assigned targets and/or report the situation to the commander as the basis for intelligent command decisions.

A guided missile cannot perform any of these functions.

During the past few days, I have personally reviewed the testimony concerning the subject of bomber flight range. Now, I can tell you that after first reading that the supersonic B–58 had very little range, I was very much surprised to find out how far it can actually go.

Without refueling, and flying 100 miles per hour faster than any other SAC bomber, it now seems clear that it can make the distance shown by the red ribbons on this global map.

Using the same tankers already bought to refuel the B–52 at the cost of over $2½ billion, the B–58 can make the distance shown by the yellow ribbon on the global map. Of course, with more than one refueling, its range is only limited by crew endurance.

Senators may recall that in its recent 1961 record smashing flight to Paris, only 3 hours and 19 minutes was required from New York—one-tenth the time required by Lindbergh. Whenever the B–58 uses its 1,300 mile-per-hour capability, as it did on its trip to Paris, it requires more fuel than when it is loafing along 100 miles per hour faster than present day bomber speeds. Using the top speed inside of Russia on its way to the target and loafing at other times, it can strike nearly all potential targets from the United States with only one refueling on the way.

Opponents of the B–58 claim that it will only carry one warhead while for the last month the airplane has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to carry five warheads.

Detractors of the B–58 claim that they are too expensive but we find that one more wing of B–58's would cost less per airplane than the B–52 which has been in production for many years.

Opponents claim that the B–58 will not carry missiles yet I am reliably advised that this ability was designed into this airplane from the very start and was successfully demonstrated several years ago.

Others claim that it has limited range at low levels, yet one recently flew unrefueled and nonstop from Forth Worth to Edwards, Calif., and back with adequate fuel reserves remaining. This flight, I am informed, was made at the speed of 690 miles per hour as compared to the low level speed of the B–52 which is 490 miles per hour—even with difference in speed we are entering a costly modification program to allow the B–52 to operate at low altitudes.

OTHER USES

I have read the proceedings of the NATO discussions with considerable interest, and I find increasing determination on the part of these allies that they be equipped with strategic deterrent capabilities of their own. I noted that the President has stated that he is willing to transfer at least five Polaris submarines to NATO forces for this purpose.

I read from the record that a Polaris submarine with its missiles cost about $130 million. I understand that to exploit its potential, one must have at least two highly skilled crews of about 60 people each and to maintain it, one also needs one expensive submarine tender for each nine submarines or fraction thereof. I am unable to find from the testimony the cost of supporting the submarine tender but, based upon the cost to maintain an outboard motorboat, the cost must be very high.

By simple arithmetic, I find that the total bang from the 16 Polaris missiles is just about the same as the yield of the five warheads carried by the supersonic B–58 and that one can get a minimum of 12 B–58's for the price of one complete Polaris submarine, less crews and tenders. We would, therefore, get twelve times as much bang potential with the B–58 for the same price.

While the thought of the Polaris submarine lurking beneath the sea paints a grim picture for the potential foes, the submarine must be lurking within its missile range of the target to be of any immediate use.

If not in range, the submarine must proceed to the launch area at speeds which do not remotely compare to the speeds of the supersonic B–58.

It has already been proven that, when placed on ground alert status, the B–58 can be off the ground in less than 2½ minutes.

The B–58 can go to its target at speeds up to 1,300 miles per hour and can be recalled anytime up to the release of the first bomb.

We know that three-quarters of the earth's surface is covered by water and/or ice, but 100 percent is covered with air.

The supersonic B–58 commander can observe the effects of his bomb and make a logical decision about the use of the other four. On the other hand, a missile launch commander never knows what happened to his missiles or its target once it is launched and, therefore, has nothing but mathematics to go by as to where he should aim his next missile. I do not say this to detract from our fine Polaris submarine capabilities; I merely demonstrate the folly of putting all our eggs in one basket. We must retain our multiple-delivery capability.

All of the NATO nations have skilled and trained air forces. Hence, the supersonic B–58, due to its unique small size, can be dispersed on nearly every commercial airport in Europe and can, if necessary, be sheltered in hardened revetments at reasonable costs.

Secretary McNamara, in his testimony, stated that his basic reason for not requesting funds for the continued production of manned strategic bombers was because of their relative vulnerability on the ground in the age of ICBM's. He concluded that he would use the available resources for, amongst other things, increased production capability for Minuteman and more Polaris submarines. His stated reasoning was that increased production potential for the Minuteman was caused by the fact that existing and planned Minuteman sites would invite concentrated Soviet ICBM attack on those sites. He would, therefore, need more units to insure adequate retaliation capability.

This logic is all right as far as it goes, but he stops far too short. In the same budget request, there is provision for the procurement of 22 conventional ships in addition to accelerated production of Polaris submarines.

I do not question the need for ships, but the vulnerability of ships in port even to conventional bombs was elaborately demonstrated at Pearl Harbor.

Fighting ships at sea are totally dependent on continuous logistic support from supply ships sailing from these same bases—they need constant replenishment in fuel, food, ammunition, and other supplies together with elaborate shipyard type facilities for repair.

Where are these bases?

On the seacoast and, in most cases, surrounded by major cities. How many of these are there compared to the number of bases and the disposition of such bases available for the operation of the B–58. There are 766 bases in the free world suitable for the dispersal and operation of the supersonic B–58.

Can we use base vulnerability as the reason to suspend production of manned strategic bombers and at the same time support the production of conventional ships?

The subject is deserving of the most careful and serious study before this Nation divests itself of such an invaluable resource as the flexible and supersonic B–58.

Before the lead times run out on the B–58 in July of this year—1961, we must act positively to insure that continuity is not lost.

If calm judgment and sound evaluation of the facts does not convince the Air Force and the Department of Defense of the wisdom of the Congress, we should consider whether or not to furnish these airplanes to NATO forces as a supplement to the Polaris submarine. Our bargaining on the Berlin situation would be most formidably enhanced by the presence of these supersonic bombers in the hands of NATO.

We must bear in mind that in the event of a nuclear outlawing, the supersonic long range B–58 still has a most impressive conventional weapons delivery capability.

Due to conflicting reports in the current statements of Department of Defense officials, we in the Congress should wisely and with calm judgment, appropriate the $525 million authorized and insist that at the very minimum our

most modern bomber production lines be kept open.

Certainly we cannot do otherwise in safety and with prudent judgment, until a thorough investigation determines the future defensive and offensive posture of the United States of America.

The coming decade and in particular the next 5 years are critical years.

Until the B–70 or other new systems become available in significant quantities, we cannot carelessly gamble with the future defense of America.

In conclusion, I wish to say again that the plane flies twice the speed of sound, and it is the only supersonic manned bomber in the free world. We are definitely far ahead of the Russians in this plane. That is why representatives of that country spend time at air shows watching the plane. It would be a great mistake to cut off production in one field where we definitely know we are far ahead of our opponents.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Aviation Week, June 12, 1961]

NEW IMAGE AT PARIS

(By Robert Hotz)

Any American who has traveled extensively in Europe during the past few years has needed no Gallup poll or U.S. Information Agency survey to tell him that U.S. prestige generally, and particularly in technical areas, has deteriorated badly in the face of Soviet space achievements contrasted with apparent U.S. reluctance to extend its traditional pioneering spirit into space. Thus, it was indeed heartening to every American at the Paris Air Show to see the United States at long last put its very best foot forward by displaying its technical capacity from light planes to outer space, along with appropriate technical and operational personnel that reflected a genuine image to Europeans of what our country is really like.

U.S. participation in the Paris Air Show was expensive in money, material and lives, yet only Commander Shepard's Mercury space shot has done more in recent years to restore the picture of the real America that Europeans hope fervently still prevails. It is understandably difficult for anybody sitting behind a desk in Washington to feel the tremendous impact of U.S. participation in this show on more than half a million Europeans ranging from French schoolchildren to technicians from 24 nations. He could not see the tremendous flow of people surging through the U.S. space exhibit that impressed both the schoolchildren and the technicians.

Crowds around Commander Shepard's heat-scorched Mercury capsule were so thick it was necessary to move outside the space exhibit tent and organize the mass flow of people past it. Accompanied by French-speaking Clotaire Wood, Advanced Research Program Coordinator for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Mercury capsule appeared on every European television network and radio hookup possible during its 10-day exhibition.

Deskbound Pentagonians could not imagine the impact of Maj. William Payne greasing a B–58 onto Le Bourget's wavy runway with hardly a puff of rubber smoke after a 6-hour 15-minute nonstop flight, including an incredible 3-hour 19-minute leg from New York to Paris, then taxiing up to the plaque on the airport tarmac where Lindbergh cut the engine of the *Spirit of St. Louis*, just 34 years earlier.

The French understood and felt deeply this "Lafayette we are here" gesture as Major Payne emerged from the cockpit looking lean, tanned, and competent, and managed a big grin and wave at the cheering crowd. A French policeman turned to American reporters and said, "That is how we like to think Americans still are." The French tried hard to win the Bleriot Cup, which has been standing as an exclusive challenge to designers and pilots for 30 years. They came close with the Mirage IV in a 21-minute run at 2,000 kilometers per hour before blistering heat cut the run short 9 minutes from Bleriot requirements. They appreciated the skilled performance required by the B–58 and its pilot Maj. Elmer (Gene) Murphy to win this coveted trophy.

In their all too brief days in Paris, Major Murphy and his crew made a tremendous impression on the technicians and military airmen of many nations they met, and all of them shared with us the tragedy of the fatal flight. Americans at the Paris show will never forget the sight of French villagers near the crater dug by the B–58 lining its blackened rim early Sunday morning with flowers, or the lines of French schoolchildren bringing flowers to Le Bourget Sunday and laying them on the Mercury capsule because it was the most tangible thing American accessible to them at the show, or the silent handshakes from French airmen and technicians conveying feelings too deep to be spoken. They understood far better than many deskbound Americans that tragedy is an inexorable part of the price of progress, and they respect us as a breed that does not shrink from this prospect.

Another outstanding aspect of American participation in the Paris Air Show was the static and flying exhibition by the very latest USAF, Navy, and Army planes, including four aircraft and two helicopters holding world records.

In contrast, the Soviets exhibited only the old familiar Tupolev 114, which has now pretty well established itself as an exhibition piece rather than a useful airline transport. This contrast between United States willingness to show its record-holding planes and Soviet reluctance to even display photos of its record-claiming planes was not lost on the European audience.

The Soviets' inability or unwillingness to display the promised new Tupolev 124 and Antonov 24 transports also raised European eyebrows.

U.S. exhibition of record-holding aircraft and flying display of the latest mach 2-plus aircraft, such as the Republic F–105, Lockheed F–104, North American A3J, McDonnell F4H, and Chance Vought FSU, coming on the heels of the open Mercury shot at Cape Canaveral, gave Europeans the impression of a strong, competent nation again flexing its technical muscles, dedicated to achieving the required superiority regardless of tardy starts in some fields, determined to reach its goals despite temporary setbacks and with the stamina to run the full course required.

This growing contrast of U.S. frankness in displaying its strength and discussing its problems with Soviet furtive secrecy regarding backup proof of its technical claims is making a tremendous impression on Europeans, and this pressure on the Soviets should be maintained at every opportunity to emphasize better than any words or propaganda broadcasts the essential difference between freedom and state slavery.

There may be some timid souls in Washington who might want to seize on the B–58 accident as an excuse for abandoning U.S. participation in international air shows. This same group fought desperately but unsuccessfully to ring down Iron Curtain secrecy on the Mercury shots, apparently under the same philosophy the Soviets show in announcing only successes. If this view prevails, the United States will suffer irreparable damage.

The significant point of both the open Mercury shot and the B–58 performances in Paris was the image they present to the world of a vital young nation still challenging the unknown and determined to master and harness new frontier science technology with the same vigor with which we expanded across the Alleghenies, the Rockies, and the Pacific—willing to risk the chance of occasional failure, but determined to press on undaunted toward ultimate success. If we ever lose that feeling as a nation or fail to convey this to people everywhere, we can begin to carve our own epitaph on our tombstone as a nation.

[From Aviation Week, June 12, 1961]

RECORD-SETTING B–58'S CRASH MARS PARIS

(By Cecil Brownlow)

PARIS.—Flying display of aircraft from 14 nations that capped the successful 24th Paris International Air Show was marred on the first of 2 flying days by the loss of a Convair B–58 supersonic bomber and its three-man crew seconds after a low pass over Le Bourget Airport.

U.S. Air Force investigators from the Strategic Air Command's 16th Air Force based in Spain and the 7th Air Division stationed in England were still sifting for clues late last week in the deep crater the B–58 dug into a field of oats 6 miles northeast of Le Bourget when it exploded on impact with the ground.

On the scene reverberations from the crash were doubly severe since the aircraft itself had earlier provided a highlight of the show by setting a new transatlantic speed record and the crew flying it at the time of the accident had received the Bleriot trophy here for establishing a new closed-course speed record (see pp. 108–109).

As a part of the static display on the days prior to the flight exhibition, the aircraft had vied for popularity with another U.S. exhibit—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's "Freedom"—Mercury capsule that carried Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on his flight down the Atlantic Missile Range in early May (Aviation Week, May 15, p. 61).

The B–58, piloted by Maj. Elmer E. Murphy, was one of six late-model U.S. aircraft in the air at the time for individual high-speed passes over the airport. The flight plan called for Major Murphy to make a low pass at a speed of approximately 550 knots, begin his climb to altitude with afterburner and execute a roll while still in view of the air show crowd.

Major Murphy made his pass, began his climb, turned on the afterburners, closed them again and was in the process of the roll when his aircraft disappeared into the low ceiling hanging over Le Bourget at an estimated altitude of approximately 4,000 feet.

That was the last seen of the aircraft by observers at the show or by Major Murphy's comrades in the air, although some on the gound and in the air witnessed a thin trail of white smoke rising from the ground northeast of Le Bourget seconds after the plane disappeared.

The smoke trail was formally reported to the Le Bourget tower for the first time by the pilot of the Lockheed F–104 in the flyby demonstration as he passed over the area.

Also in the aircraft at the time were Major Murphy's fellow recipients of the Bleriot trophy—Maj. Eugene F. Moses, navigator, and 1st Lt. David F. Dickerson, defensive systems operator. All three were attached to SAC's 43d Bomb Wing, Carswell AFB, Tex.

SHOW FLYBY

Award of the trophy at the air show stemmed from a May 10 flight by the Murphy

crew in the United States in which the crew's B-58 flew a closed course of 669.438 miles in 30 minutes 43 seconds at an average speed of 1,302.07 miles per hour. The flight was the first to meet the stipulations laid down in 1930 by pioneer French aviator Louis Bleriot for the permanent possession of the trophy which specified that an aircraft should fly a closed-circuit course at a minimum speed of 620 miles per hour for a period of at least 30 minutes.

On May 26, opening day of the air show, the B-58 then piloted by Maj. William Payne, also a member of the 43d Bomb Wing, had gained a stroke for the United States in the international prestige race with its nonstop transatlantic flight that initially began at Carswell AFB. Total elapsed time between Carswell and Le Bourget including two in-flight refuelings was 6 hours 15 minutes of which 1 hour 49 minutes was flown at speeds of mach 2.

Flight leg between New York and Paris was 3 hours 19 minutes.

Some top U.S.A.F. officials and Convair personnel at the air show urged after the crash that a second B-58 be rushed from the United States to France so that it could fill the gap in the final day's flyby and dampen, if not completely offset, any adverse effects on French public opinion from the previous day's crash after the aircraft had made such a promising beginning in this area.

MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I intended to offer today an amendment to extend the special milk program. I withheld it because this morning the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted favorably on the special milk bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and other Senators, and of which I am one of the cosponsors. The proposed program will extend the special milk program for another year.

I ask unanimous consent, however, that certain documentation which I have received from the Department of Agriculture on this special milk program, stating the number of outlets participating in the months of July and August 1960, as well as the amount of milk consumed, and for which there was reimbursement in July and August 1960, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1961.

Hon. ——— ———,
U.S. Senate,

SENATOR: This is in response to your request for information on schools and child-care institutions, including summer camps, that normally participate in the special milk program during the summer months.

Our records show that over 6,000 schools and institutions were in the program in July of last year and more than 8,000 in August. Tables providing this information, State by State, are attached.

The two additional tables show the number of half pints of milk that were consumed and on which Federal reimbursement was paid during July and August 1960. The larger quantity in July—35 million half pints compared with 31.1 million in August—reflects the summer camp participation which begins in June and is heaviest in July.

Records maintained under this program do not provide information on the number of children participating.

Sincerely yours,

S. R. SMITH,
Acting Administrator.

Special milk program—Number of outlets participating, July 1960

State	Schools	Child-care institutions [1]	Total
Alabama	3	39	42
Alaska	1	3	4
Arizona	6	31	37
Arkansas	114	22	136
California	409	633	1,042
Colorado	17	40	57
Connecticut			
Delaware		27	27
District of Columbia		3	3
Florida	4	82	86
Georgia	6	68	74
Hawaii	4	22	26
Idaho	2	21	23
Illinois			
Indiana			
Iowa	5	56	61
Kansas			
Kentucky	7	46	53
Louisiana	21	52	73
Maine		58	58
Maryland	6	88	94
Massachusetts	24	282	306
Michigan	10	161	171
Minnesota	6	136	142
Mississippi	135	18	153
Missouri	61	59	120
Montana	2	29	31
Nebraska	5	25	30
Nevada	1	14	15
New Hampshire		62	62
New Jersey	1	201	202
New Mexico	115	8	123
New York	466	464	930
North Carolina	4	91	95
North Dakota	1	15	16
Ohio	15	278	293
Oklahoma	20	48	68
Oregon		70	70
Pennsylvania	93	320	413
Rhode Island	1	26	27
South Carolina	8	49	57
South Dakota [2]			
Tennessee	101	70	171
Texas	83	80	163
Utah	2	20	22
Vermont	2	23	25
Virginia	11	64	75
Washington	9	165	174
West Virginia		42	42
Wisconsin	17	169	186
Wyoming			
Total	1,798	4,280	6,078

[1] Primarily represents summer camps.
[2] Consolidated with August report.

Special milk program—Number of outlets participating, August 1960

State	Schools	Child-care institutions [1]	Total
Alabama	144	26	170
Alaska		2	2
Arizona	10	26	36
Arkansas	158	14	172
California	255	545	800
Colorado	27	61	88
Connecticut		91	91
Delaware		24	24
District of Columbia		3	3
Florida	8	62	70
Georgia	22	50	72
Hawaii	6	19	25
Idaho	96	24	120
Illinois [2]			
Indiana	19	220	239
Iowa	33	33	66
Kansas	2	55	57
Kentucky	162	35	197
Louisiana	206	38	244
Maine	38	62	100
Maryland	6	67	73
Massachusetts	23	237	260
Michigan	7	167	174
Minnesota	6	122	128
Mississippi	165	14	179
Missouri	197	46	243
Montana	2	14	16
Nebraska	6	15	21
Nevada	1	6	7
New Hampshire		63	68
New Jersey	2	178	183
New Mexico	143	3	140
New York	463	445	906
North Carolina	230	92	322
North Dakota	12	6	18
Ohio	15	244	259
Oklahoma	207	41	248
Oregon		54	54
Pennsylvania	497	294	791
Rhode Island		23	23
South Carolina	143	43	186
South Dakota	66	9	75
Tennessee	494	46	540
Texas	101	66	167
Utah	85	15	100
Vermont	3	22	25
Virginia	9	48	57
Washington	9	114	123
West Virginia		22	22
Wisconsin	55	117	172
Wyoming		23	23
Total	4,133	4,046	8,179

[1] Primarily represents summer camps.
[2] Data not available. Consolidated with September report.

Special milk program—Number of outlets participating, August 1960—Continued

Number of half-pints reimbursed, July 1960

[In thousands]

State	Schools	Child-care institutions [1]	Total
Alabama	3	189	192
Alaska		8	8
Arizona	21	98	119
Arkansas	193	116	309
California	765	2,622	3,387
Colorado	83	2,554	2,637
Connecticut [2]			
Delaware		116	116
District of Columbia		9	9
Florida	30	249	279
Georgia	6	287	293
Hawaii	5	28	33
Idaho	3	123	126
Illinois [3]			
Indiana [2]			
Iowa	18	391	409
Kansas			
Kentucky	6	246	252
Louisiana	43	215	258
Maine		654	654
Maryland	38	549	587
Massachusetts	407	1,641	2,048
Michigan	69	1,516	1,585
Minnesota	25	785	810
Mississippi	406	122	528
Missouri	137	449	586
Montana	8	70	78
Nebraska	36	122	158
Nevada	2	30	32
New Hampshire		638	638
New Jersey	4	1,875	1,879
New Mexico	6	141	147
New York	1,610	3,910	5,520
North Carolina	8	551	559
North Dakota	6	88	94
Ohio	133	1,787	1,920
Oklahoma	13	157	170
Oregon		251	251
Pennsylvania	150	3,047	3,197
Rhode Island	1	286	287
South Carolina	52	376	428
South Dakota [2]			
Tennessee	258	337	595
Texas	393	408	801
Utah		93	93
Vermont	11	209	220
Virginia	41	386	427
Washington	70	542	612
West Virginia		170	170
Wisconsin	58	1,521	1,579
Wyoming			
Total	5,118	29,962	35,080

[1] Represents primarily summer camps.
[2] Consolidated with August report.
[3] Consolidated with September report.

Number of half-pints reimbursed, August 1960

[In thousands]

State	Schools	Child-care institutions [1]	Total
Alabama	180	89	269
Alaska		7	7
Arizona	43	79	122
Arkansas	348	39	387
California	401	2,334	2,735
Colorado	57	420	477
Connecticut		1,039	1,039
Delaware		101	101
District of Columbia		8	8
Florida	11	161	172
Georgia	34	192	226
Hawaii	4	44	48
Idaho	16	94	110
Illinois [2]			
Indiana	1	1,411	1,424
Iowa	30	169	199
Kansas	2	329	331
Kentucky	126	179	305
Louisiana	102	130	232
Maine	6	441	447
Maryland	28	344	372
Massachusetts	359	1,219	1,578
Michigan	61	1,143	1,204
Minnesota	19	593	612
Mississippi	774	66	840
Missouri	379	165	544
Montana	8	17	25
Nebraska	32	58	90
Nevada	5	7	12
New Hampshire		504	504
New Jersey	7	1,555	1,562
New Mexico	494	100	594
New York	1,405	3,571	4,976
North Carolina	143	536	679
North Dakota	43	27	70
Ohio	136	1,242	1,378
Oklahoma	155	128	283
Oregon		176	176
Pennsylvania	256	2,017	2,273
Rhode Island		211	211
South Carolina	108	326	434
South Dakota	278	12	290
Tennessee	897	151	1,048
Texas	373	268	641
Utah	53	65	118
Vermont	13	109	122
Virginia	15	226	241
Washington	67	445	512
West Virginia		75	75
Wisconsin	61	934	995
Wyoming		48	48
Total	7,542	23,604	31,146

[1] Represents primarily summer camps.
[2] Consolidated with September report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this program is one of the important food programs, and I know that Congress will act quickly to assure the continuation of the program. It will expire unless we act in the next few days.

I also observe that the bill on agricultural appropriations provided moneys for the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the soil conservation program, the school lunch program, the direct food distribution programs. We provided funds for the rural redevelopment program as well as the agriculture research program, the farm income and price support programs, the national food reserves and, the food-for-peace program.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations and a former member of the legislative Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I strongly urge that the Secretary of Agriculture use the farmer-owned and farmer-developed cooperatives and their facilities to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the accomplishment of the objectives of the laws and programs which I have mentioned, and the effective and efficient conduct of his responsibilities in respect to those programs.

I make this statement because it is important that in the administration of the agricultural policies that the use of the farmer-developed and farmer-owned institutions for these programs be maximized. Later on in the basic legislation which the Committee on Agriculture is considering, I intend to offer more specific language on this point, then it will be not merely a matter of legislative history and Congressional intent but it will be manifestly clear that the Secretary be directed to use the farmer cooperatives and their facilities to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the accomplishment of the objectives of the programs and policies that are outlined in the so-called agricultural programs.

Again I wish to express my personal commendation and thanks to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for his expert handling of the agricultural appropriations bill. I am pleased that we were able to defeat an amendment which would have cut very sharply the soil conservation payments under what is called the ACP program. This is one of the better programs. It would have been unwise to have reduced it at all. I wish to thank my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his courtesy in permitting me to make this statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for two short insertions?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield briefly.

THE TEST BAN

Mr. CLARK. One of the matters which is now undergoing wide national debate, which debate is also taking place in the Senate, is whether we should resume nuclear testing because we have been unable to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union.

I commend to my colleagues a very carefully thought-out article on this subject which appears in the Washington Post this morning, written by Mr. Walter Lippmann. He points out something to which we should give careful attention. He says:

> What is certain in the whole business is that we cannot assume, as some among us do, that the resumption of testing would benefit only the United States and not the Soviet Union.

He points out:

> That the decision which the President will now have to make is not obvious, is not open and shut, is shown by the fact that, while warning the Soviet Union that without treaty we shall be free to resume testing, he has not yet ordered testing to be resumed. For he has first to determine whether the net balance of advantages would be substantially on our side.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THE TEST BAN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The negotiations on testing were resumed at Geneva on March 21 after they had been suspended for about 10 months as the result of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev quarrel. During the interval there had been important changes in the positions of both sides.

The United States went to considerable length in offering concessions, calculated carefully with one eye on what it was hoped that Khrushchev would accept and with the other eye on what the Senate would ratify. What was not foreseen was that during the long recess, the position of the Soviet Union would change radically.

The change was marked by the new demand for the Troika, for a three-man administration, and the change was accompanied by many signs that the Soviet Union has lost interest in the whole idea of a treaty to prohibit nuclear testing.

This loss of interest in any treaty is, I believe, far more important than the disagreements at Geneva. The memorandum which Mr. Khrushchev handed to the President in Vienna on June 4, and which was published on June 12, shows that the Troika business could become negotiable if there existed a will to conclude a treaty. Thus the Soviet memorandum denies that it wants a veto on inspection. The American memorandum of June 17, a very able document, disagrees sharply with the Soviet memorandum which says that there would be no veto against "on the spot inspection within the limits of the agreed quotas * * * at the request of the side interested in the inspection without any voting on the control position or any other agency." But the disagreement is not so wide here that it could not be bridged if there was a will to do so.

The evidence is strong, however, that the Soviet Government does not now want a treaty, and that it looks without regret upon the breakdown of the whole negotiation. Thus it has proposed that the negotiations be carried over into the coming disarmament conference, which amounts to proposing an indefinite delay in reaching an agreement. Moreover, I have a strong impression that there is more to the matter than emphasizing the Troika problem, which is soluble in the narrow confines of the nuclear test ban. It is in order to establish a precedent for the much greater crisis of the United Nations, which is coming.

The central question for the President in forming American policy is why the Soviet Government is now so little interested in concluding a treaty. A part of the answer, but truly not the whole answer, may well be that the Red Chinese are refusing to adhere to the treaty because they are determined to become a nuclear power in their own right. Were Mr. Khrushchev to conclude a treaty with the United States, it might mean a serious break with Mao Tse-Tung.

Another part of the answer, though I would guess a small part of it, may be that if we reject the treaty because of the Troika, we shall be the country that resumed nuclear testing which the neutrals fear and hate because we refused to let neutrals participate in administering the ban.

But I cannot help thinking that there is some harder reason than either of these why the Soviet Union has lost interest in the treaty.

Presumably, this harder reason lies in the relative advantages to each side if the present moratorium on testing were removed. Initially, this is a problem for the experts. The experts, however, will not be unanimous and laymen, notably the President himself, will have to decide between them. The President's decision will have to be based on a searching examination and cross examination of the experts.

What is certain in the whole business is that we cannot assume, as some among us do, that the resumption of testing would benefit only the United States and not the Soviet Union. We cannot assume this because if the benefits were one-sided, the Soviet Union would be much more concerned

than it is to conclude an agreement. For the Soviet Union is not in the business of helping the United States.

I am told by those who ought to know that while the Soviet scientists and technicians are as good as our own, our weapons and our technology are considerably more advanced and more sophisticated than theirs. If this is true, the question is whether with a resumption of testing, they will catch up with us, perhaps surpass us. For we must remember that the end of the moratorium would permit testing not only underground but anywhere.

We can be certain, I believe, that if the Soviet Union decided that testing in the air was vital to its security, it would test in the air. Also, we do know with reasonable certainty that the Soviet Union is interested in the biggest nuclear weapons, not in tactical nuclear weapons. For as a matter of policy, the Soviet Union does not engage itself directly in small wars, like the Korean war for example, and in conventional forces it is paramount on its own frontiers and within its own sphere of influence.

Moreover, with its superiority in rockets, it is less interested than we are in smaller and lighter weapons. It is concerned primarily that, if nuclear weapons are used at all, they should be big enough to be decisive. All this may help to explain why the Soviet Union looks with so much equanimity on the resumption of testing.

That the decision which the President will now have to make is not obvious, it not open-and-shut, is shown by the fact that, while warning the Soviet Union that without a treaty we shall be free to resume testing, he has not yet ordered testing to be resumed. For he has first to determine whether the net balance of advantages would be substantially on our side.

TIME FOR A UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. In this morning's New York Times there appears an editorial which I commend to my colleagues. It is entitled "Time for a U.N. Conference." I have urged on the floor that the time is long past due when we should be seeking an opportunity to revise the charter of the United Nations in the light of modern conditions. The charter is at present obsolete. We know the earnest efforts of the Soviet Union to revise it drastically. We should not meet that threat with negativism on our part, with merely a refusal to change the charter in any way.

In my judgment, comprehensive changes are required. I expect to address the Senate on this subject at a later date.

In the meantime, I commend to my colleagues the comments of the editorial to the effect that there is urgent need for the United States to seek to preserve the world organization as an instrument of peace, and to insist on a general conference for a review of the United Nations Charter as provided in the charter itself. Such a conference is long overdue.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in conclusion I express my deep regret that the State Department in general, and the Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs in particular, does not at the moment seem disposed to recognize the justice and the soundness of the position taken by the New York Times in its editorial.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy in yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1961]

TIME FOR A U.N. CONFERENCE

The latest proposals by a committee of experts for the reorganization of the United Nations emphasizes the urgent need for all nations seeking to preserve this world organization as an instrument of peace to insist on the general conference for review, as provided in the charter.

Such a conference, long overdue, has been prevented by Soviet opposition. Now the Russians themselves demand a reorganization. The other members must not stand aside or consent to a piecemeal emasculation of the United Nations by "compromise" proposals ostensibly designed to head off the Soviet attempt to rule or wreck it.

The Soviet drive concentrates on three immediate objectives. The first and most dangerous—resulting from the Soviet debacle in the Congo—is to oust Secretary General Hammarskjold, to abolish his office and to paralyze all United Nations executive capacity. The second Russian objective is to oust many present members of the Secretariat to make room for additional Communist or doubtfully neutralist personnel. And the third objective, for which the Soviets exploit incidents of racial discrimination in this country, is to move the United Nations headquarters from New York to Vienna.

In brief, Khrushchev seeks to break up the United Nations from top to bottom into power blocs and to substitute for its universally valid principles the intrigues of power politics. This would represent a drastic change in the very concept on which the United Nations has been founded—a change which would imperil not the big powers that can take care of themselves but the smaller nations who would become mere pawns in the Soviet imperialist game that does not admit the possibility of true neutrality.

Most of the smaller nations do, in fact, recognize this peril. But rather than meet the Soviet drive head on they propose compromises which play into Russian hands. Such a compromise is the modified "troika" plan to create three Deputy Secretaries General who, though working under Mr. Hammarskjold, would be able to undercut his authority and hamper United Nations action. Such a compromise is the plan to allocate the 3,100 posts in the Secretariat according to the population of member nations. This plan would replace the concept of an independent international civil service with a system of poltical patronage, based on national subservience. It would be a violation of the charter, which forbids member nations to seek to influence the Secretary General or his staff and provides, with due regard for the widest possible geographical distribution, that the "paramount consideration" in the selection of the staff must be "the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity." The present employment quotas based on each member's budgetary contribution have roughly met these demands. The population scheme could not.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS TOMORROW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized to open the debate on Senate Resolution 148, which is the pending business, and that upon being recognized I may yield the floor, for independent remarks by them, to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon; and that after the morning hour tomorrow, when the consideration of Senate Resolution 148 is resumed, I may be recognized to resume the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON MONEY AND CREDIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the long-awaited report of the Commission on Money and Credit, established by the Committee for Economic Development, and sponsored by several of our large foundations, was released yesterday. This Commission, made up of a diverse group of distinguished Americans, assisted by an able staff and a group of advisers of great competence, has been considering the structure and policies of our monetary institutions. The Commission's report will undoubtedly receive and certainly deserves a great deal of study and consideration and I have no doubt that it will get it.

As in any such Commission report, there is much with which one can agree and disagree. I am sure that on further study, I will find some specific proposals with which I cannot concur fully, or perhaps approve. These points will come out as one has an opportunity to study the Commission's report more thoroughly.

At the same time, it is gratifying, to find that this distinguished and conservative group of men from the business, banking, and professional communities, after mature consideration and study extending over nearly 3 years, has come to many of the same conclusions and recommendations which I have been urging based upon my study as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and as a member and sometime Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. It is not only gratifying but I suppose we in Congress should feel reassured that many of the principles advocated in our reports have received acceptance from this distinguished group.

When the Joint Economic Committee ended its year-long study of the economy in January of 1960, we made many similar recommendations. We thought that these recommendations were well thought out, orthodox in conception, and aimed at a more competitive and more efficient economy. But our recommendations were opposed by most of the banking community, by almost the entire financial press and financial writers, and by most of the Republican members of our committee. I have seldom received such a tongue lashing as was meted out to me at that time by some of my Republican colleagues.

Now we find that this distinguished group of people have made numerous recommendations which are either very similar or in some cases exactly like

those which we Democrats on the committee made.

I am very pleased with this fact. I think it vindicates our recommendations. I hope that the banking community, the financial papers and financial writers, and some of the leading members of the minority party in the House and Senate may at long last give us some of the credit which was originally due.

While my examination of the items is limited because of time, I would like to cite a few of the many parallel recommendations between those of our committee or of myself and the Commission on Money and Credit.

First. In the 1960 Joint Economic Committee report, presented while I was chairman in the last Congress, as well as on numerous other occasions, we have urged "in the area of monetary policy, we offer as a general prescription, that the supply of money—that is, currency held outside banks and adjusted demand deposits—should increase over time at about the same rate as gross national product, allowing for normal velocity," page 15.

The Commission on Money and Credit, coming to a similar conclusion, states:

> The relatively slow growth of the money supply since 1951 was, in considerable measure, a reflection and embodiment of the generally restrictive tone of monetary policy.
>
> The average rate of growth of the money supply should reflect the rate of growth of real output at high employment and stable prices (p. 61).

Second. The majority of the Joint Economic Committee have repeatedly recommended that "the Federal Reserve System should abandon its bills-only policy"—Employment, Growth, and Price Levels, Senate Report 1043, 86th Congress, page 34; 1960 Joint Economic Report, Senate Report 1152, 86th Congress, page 16.

This recommendation was bitterly fought by the Federal Reserve Board itself and bitterly fought by the financial writers and by most of the Republican members of the committee.

The Commission, in recommending the use of open market operations states:

> Instead of relying on a bills-only policy, the Federal Reserve should be willing, when domestic or international conditions warrant, to influence directly the structure as well as the level of interest rates in pursuit of countercyclical monetary policies and should deal in securities of varied maturities (p. 64).

Third. The Joint Economic Committee last year included, as a major recommendation—

> The Federal Reserve should use open market operations rather than lowering reserve requirements as the means of bringing about the secular expansion of credit which the Federal Reserve and the banks desire. (S. Rept. 1152, p. 16.)

The Commission states that it "believes that the power to change reserve requirements should be used only sparingly and favors major reliance on the use of open market operations for countercyclical adjustments," page 67.

Fourth. Nearly 10 years ago, a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, stated:

> We recommend that all banks which accept demand deposits, including both member and nonmember banks, be made subject to the same set of reserve requirements and that all such banks be given access to loans at the Federal Reserve banks. (Document No. 129, 81st Cong., p. 2.)

In the report just issued today, the Commission on Money and Credit "recommends that the demand deposits reserve requirements of all member banks be made identical and that the classification of banks into country banks and reserve city banks be eliminated," page 69.

Fifth. In the same 10-year-old subcommittee report, we recommended that—

> Every effort be made to build up the quality and prestige of the Federal Reserve officials; among these measures should be a reduction in the number of the members of the Board of Governors from seven to not more than five * * * and an increase in their compensation. (Document No. 129, 81st Cong., p. 2.)

The Commission on Money and Credit, noting that—

> A reduction in numbers should enhance the status of members recommends that the Federal Reserve Board should consist of five members * * * occupation and geographical qualifications for Board members should be eliminated. Instead the statute should stipulate that members shall be positively qualified by experience or education, competence, independence, and objectivity commensurate with the increased responsibility recommended for them * * * the salaries of top officials throughout the Government should be sharply increased and in view of the gravity of their responsibilities, FRB members should be compensated at the highest salary level available for appointive offices in the Government (pp. 87–88).

Sixth. The Joint Economic Committee has repeatedly urged the Treasury Department to place more reliance upon the auction method for selling not only short-term but long-term securities—Senate Report 1043, 86th Congress, page 47; Senate Report 1152, 86th Congress, page 16; House Report 328, 87th Congress, page 39.

Mr. President, the joint committee urged this upon former Secretary of the Treasury Anderson again and again and again, but had no response.

The Commission on Money and Credit, urging that less reliance upon administrative pricing of Treasury offerings is desirable, recommends "that the Treasury should continue to experiment further with the use of the auction technique," page 115.

Seventh. In its report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels, the Joint Economic Committee noted that—

> Advance refunding * * * can be an important means of lengthening the debt. Through advance refunding, the Treasury substantially reduces the attrition which it ordinarily suffers when long-term issues are refinanced." (S. Rept. 1043, 86th Cong., p. 36.)

The Commission on Money and Credit, noting that under the advance refunding technique, there would be less market "churning" recommends "that the Treasury continue to experiment with the use of advanced refunding technique," page 114.

Eighth. The Joint Economic Committee reported to the Congress some time ago that—

> The greatest contribution which debt management could make to the long-run attainment of our economic objectives would be to reduce its interference with monetary policy. A longer average maturity of the debt would help to attain this objective. The Treasury would have to come to the market less often and the switching in and out of Government securities over the business cycle by financial institutions, which reduces the effectiveness of monetary policy, would be somewhat reduced. (S. Rept. 1043, 86th Cong., pp. 35 and 36.)

The Commission on Money and Credit notes that—

> Regularization of Treasury offerings would reduce the difficulty of refunding operations occurring at erratic intervals. It would broaden the interest in Treasury securities by encouraging the periodic allocation of funds for new Treasury issues by both individuals and institutional investors and by reducing uncertainty about the timing and maturity of new issues (p. 113).

Ninth. The Joint Economic Committee has repeatedly urged and I am happy to say that with its promptings and insistence upon the disclosure of statistical information relating to the trading in the Treasury security market, data is now published weekly on the operations of the so-called 17 dealers in Treasury securities.

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that when this recommendation was first made, it was treated very coldly, indeed. In its report, the Commission on Money and Credit, having conducted most of its study before these statistics became publicly available, comments upon the desirability and "welcomes the publication of the new weekly data," page 120.

Tenth. One problem which has been of great concern to me personally on which I have commented in hearings before various committees on more than one occasion, has been the danger of placing too great confidence in our standard unemployment statistics since they make no allowance for what I call involuntary part-time unemployment.

The Commission on Money and Credit, after its extensive study, expresses a similar concern, noting that—

> The present system of reporting unemployment makes no allowance for the loss of manhours which occur when people work fewer hours than they wish (p. 24).

Eleventh. In its annual report this year, the Joint Economic Committee called for a review of the actions of the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee, as reported in the Board's Annual Reports, and just this month, under the chairmanship of Representative PATMAN, the trend of testimony seemed to suggest that there was much to be desired in this area of publicity respecting the exercise of these great monetary powers, page 47.

The Commission on Money and Credit, noting that accurate information would probably be less dangerous than rumors

being continuously circulated about Federal Reserve policy, stated:

Although there is no easy solution to this issue, the Commission believes that the Federal Reserve should follow the general rule that the public should be kept informed with reasonable promptness and with reasonable detail of the reasons for its policy decisions and actions in order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation (p. 92).

Twelfth. In considering the solution to our balance-of-payments problem, the Joint Economic Committee, among other things, stated, in its annual report:

We recommend elimination of the dollar gold reserve requirement, now equal to 25 percent of Federal Reserve notes and deposits. This requirement is irrelevant to both the supply of and the value of the dollar, and removing the requirement will reenforce the President's pledge, made in his state of the Union message, that the full strength of all our reserves stands behind the value of the dollar for use if needed. (H. Rept. No. 328, 87th Cong., p. 39.)

The Commission on Money and Credit has arrived at much the same conclusions:

The Commission believes that threat of a confidence crisis would be greatly reduced if it were generally recognized, both here and abroad, that all of the U.S. gold is available to meet our international obligations. Any doubts about the U.S. policy should be removed by elimination of the gold reserve requirement at the earliest convenient moment so that all of the U.S. gold stock is available for international settlement.

Thirteenth. Upon a number of occasions we have commented on the need for coordination of monetary and fiscal policies, most recently in the Joint Economic Committee's annual report, where we state:

We would be remiss if we failed to observe that present coordination of monetary and fiscal policies appears to be less than desired. * * * In any case, the Nation cannot afford to have the highest policymaking bodies of the Federal Government following conflicting policies, supported though they may be by different assumptions as to what the economic facts are. (H. Rept. No. 328, 87th Cong., p. 37.)

The Commission on Money and Credit recognizes this problem sufficient to offer one possible solution, namely:

The FRB Chairman and Vice Chairman should be designated by the President from among the Board's membership to serve for 4 years coterminous with the President's.

Mr. President, I call attention to that recommendation and say that if it were to be carried out, the President of the United States would at this time have the power to appoint a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Again, I find some satisfaction in discovering that these diverse experts gathered from the financial and business community have, after such thorough deliberation, come to much the same conclusions which some of us in Congress have been urging. I have listed only a few of them, I am sure.

But I hope that these conclusions will be noted by the financial community and writers and that they may now have the good sportsmanship to admit that our proposals were, in the main, sound.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for the speech he has just made. As usual, when the Senator from Illinois speaks, he conducts an educational seminar on any subject he takes up. The one he discussed tonight is most enlightening to those of us who had the pleasure of hearing it, and it will be very educational to those who read it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

WABASH RIVER FLOODS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during the week of June 8 a delegation from Illinois and Indiana representing the Wabash Valley Association at Mt. Carmel, Ill., and the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission at Terre Haute, Ind., came to Washington to testify in behalf of necessary funds for the survey and other related flood control projects along the Wabash River and its tributaries. I understand that most of these businessmen and farmers traveled here at their own expense. On Wednesday of last week I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of their Wabash Valley program.

My interest in this whole situation is by no means recent. The Senate Public Works Committee, back in 1956, adopted a resolution I submitted to cause a flood-control study to be made. Again, in 1958, the committee adopted another of my resolutions to enlarge the scope of the study and investigation to include the development and conservation of water and related resources in the Wabash River Basin.

Over the past 14 years this area of Illinois and Indiana has suffered great and severe losses from 11 major floods. The farmers in the valley have had to plant two or more crops over the years. Emergency repairs to the damaged levees and other related projects caused by the floods last month are now underway in 10 Indiana and 5 Illinois counties. Also the Army Engineers are furnishing teams to make a survey estimate of flood damage due to debris and silting of streams in the disaster area counties of both States for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in the Mercury-Independent of Grayville, Ill., with respect to the damages in this area.

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

[From the Grayville (Ill.) Mercury-Independent, June 15, 1961]

DAMAGES CAUSED BY MARCH FLOOD

The delegation from the Wabash Valley Association which went to Washington last week to ask for increased appropriations for flood control told the Public Works Subcommittees of the House and the Senate that damages caused by the March flood amounted to $100 million.

This may appear to many folks to be an enormous sum and much higher than the loss sustained by Illinois and Indiana property owners. But who is in a better position to estimate the flood losses than George Gettinger, the executive vice president, who travels up and down the valley and talks to individuals as well as groups in the 80 or more counties in the immense watershed of the valley. He traveled 59,000 miles last year.

Losses by flood affect everyone. Everyone knows, of course, floods damage farms, that they cause even more loss to farmers if they occur during crop seasons. The March flood destroyed thousands of acres of wheat and clover, delayed farmers in preparation of ground for spring planting of corn and soybeans.

What many people do not realize is that tax bills of virtually everyone who pays local taxes are apt to be higher because of flood damages to public property. Floods damage local roads, State highways, city streets, bridges, and other public installations; taxes must be continued at present or higher levels, which may even be insufficient, to repair those damages.

All private business in the valley is affected. When farm crops and farm property are damaged, when public property must be repaired at high tax costs, when city folks driven out of their homes sustain damage to their homes and furnishings merchants ring up less sales on their cash registers. Who is in a position to deny the loss in the Wabash Valley is less than $10 million this year?

There have been 11 major floods since 1947. The loss in each of those floods may not have been as high; but at half the estimate for this year the total amount is stupendous. They can be prevented. But they will not be prevented or stopped unless more and more people realize they are hit in their own pocketbooks there won't be enough pressure to convince Congress of the need for sufficient Federal appropriations.

The prosperity, even the livelihood of thousands in the valley, is directly dependent on how many people will join in the campaign.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ALLEGING USE OF RUSSIAN PLANES IN CUBAN INVASION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the early edition of the Washington Star of yesterday, June 19, carried an article headlined "Pilots of Migs in Cuba Know Their Business."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PILOTS OF MIGS IN CUBA KNOW THEIR BUSINESS

NEW YORK, June 19 (NANA).—There is no doubt that Russian Migs were in action in Cuba during the recent invasion attempt, but it is not known with certainty who was flying them, according to an unimpeachable Washington source.

A spokesman for the Cuban Revolutionary Council here, a pilot himself, said that the planes' approach and strife tactics were "highly professional," which would imply a training in formation flying for several years.

"When attacking ground targets with either rockets or machineguns," he continued, "a high-speed plane of the Mig type has only from 2 seconds to a fraction of a second in which to fire.

"The planes sighted in Cuba," he said, "attacked in perfect inline formation and appeared to be operating against the freedom fighters in Cochino Bay and Matanzas from San Julian Air Force Base at San Antonio de los Banos, near Havana."

According to reports from recently defected Cuban Air Force pilots, 70 of the 200 Cubans who had been sent to Czechoslovakia for aviation training are still in Czechoslovakia. The remaining 130 have been brought back to Cuba, the reports say.

The defectors, according to the spokesman, said that the brevity of the pilots' training in Czechoslovakia gives reason to believe they did not complete their course.

"The air force base at San Julian," they said, "is the most guarded military installation around Havana, and only a handful of Cuban Air Force officers have been allowed to go near it."

The same air force defectors indicated that an unspecified number of Czech test pilots and gunnery instructors were stationed at San Julian Air Force Base.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call attention to the first paragraph of the article, which attributes to "an unimpeachable Washington source" the statement that Russian Migs were used in repelling the invasion attempt by Cuban exiles.

As the chairman of the Senate subcommittee which has been hearing from many witnesses who took part in either the planning or the operation of that invasion attempt, I can state that every official source from which we have heard has agreed that no Russian Migs appeared in that action.

I do not know who "the unimpeachable Washington source" may be; but his statements are completely contrary to what our subcommittee has been told about that situation; and in the course of our hearings we have heard testimony from top-ranking officials in the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

In fact, Mr. President, I wish to say that we were offered no evidence that any Russian planes of any make were involved in the Cuban invasion. To the contrary, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the evidence is perfectly clear that the planes used by the Castro forces were United States and British planes, in origin, apparently supplied to Batista, when the United States wrote in American history the very unfortunate chapter of supporting with military arms the tyrant Batista in his misrule of Cuba.

I certainly have a right to make comment about the Batista regime, because I led the fight, here in the Senate, against American military support of Batista; and in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I warned the Senate and the country that we were making a grievous mistake. I was also the first Member of the Senate to protest the tyranny of Castro, because insofar as human rights and individual liberties are concerned, the totalitarian procedures of Castro are no different from the totalitarian procedures of Batista; it is a truism that two wrongs cannot make a right.

Mr. President, when Castro came into power, he took over the Batista planes, and they were American and British made planes. It is within the framework of propriety to say that on the basis of information given at our hearing, I am satisfied that very, very few of those planes were used in repelling the Cuban invasion—less than half of the number of planes used by the Cuban exiles, although there was some difference in type. But that small number of Castro planes very quickly gained supremacy in the air, apparently because they were better planes and had better pilots.

That was a very unfortunate development, from the standpoint of the Cuban exiles, although as I have considered the complexities of the Cuban invasion, I have often wondered who might have thought of an answer to the question, "Suppose the Cuban exiles had won: where would we have been then; would we have been ready to take the necessary steps"—which I think would have had to have been military steps—"thereafter?"

But, Mr. President, be that as it may, I have a lurking suspicion that this "unimpeachable Washington source" might very well have been some of the Cuban exile pilots who were defeated by the Castro pilots in that wholly unfortunate maneuver, and that that may be what we call an alibi for a defeat.

Mr. President, if there had been any Russian Migs, or, for that matter, any Russian planes, I do not have to tell the Senate that we would have heard about that from our official Government sources, because they, too, needed some alibis. But, to their everlasting credit, they presented what we have every reason to believe were the facts in regard to the airpower which was used in that fiasco; and apparently that airpower did not include either Russian Migs or any other Russian planes.

But, Mr. President, I am disturbed about such newspaper articles as this one; and there are other articles of that sort—sometimes referred to as "dope stories" or "smoking-out stories" or "trial-balloon stories"; and I think we can probably expect more of them to appear. I am fully aware of the fact, as are other members of my subcommittee, that there is some disappointment, if not actual criticism and opposition, because of the fact that my subcommittee has been conducting executive hearings. Of course I believe we should. We hope to close them this week, or not later than the first part of next week.

The information we have received fully justifies, in my judgment, the unanimous decision of the committee to conduct executive hearings.

For the benefit of the press, or at least the critical segment of the press, I announce again that it is my intention to recommend to the full Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the transcript of record be transmitted to the President when the hearings are concluded, with the offer to place ourselves at his service and command if, after reading the transcript, he might wish to discuss any of the points raised in the manuscript with either members of the subcommittee or members of the full committee or with any individual members thereof.

It is my hope that, after such a report has been made to the President, subject to his pleasure and his decision, a chronological summary might be published that will set forth, in step-by-step fashion, the events of that ill-fated adventure, so as to remove doubts and questions and unfair criticisms on the part of those in the public who are greatly puzzled as to how the adventure came about.

It seems to me only with the submission to the public of such a chronological summary, duly and properly edited from the standpoint of protecting the security of our country, can there be any basis for debate and discussion of the questions of policy.

I think such a summary would tend to end charges and countercharges and end the efforts to frighten the American people into unsound action.

I want to make very clear that, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the President is my Commander in Chief. This study was undertaken only to be of help to the President. We felt that in so doing we would also be carrying out our constitutional responsibilities to serve in an advise-and-consent capacity. And we have a responsibility to the voters to function as a check upon any administration, whether it is this one or any other one, in the field of foreign policy—recognizing that under the Constitution it is the President who is the administrator of foreign policy, but, in the last analysis, it is the inalienable and constitutional right of the American people to determine what that foreign policy shall be.

As a constitutional liberal, I shall, of course, always seek to prevent the development in the administration of this Government of any secrecy in the handling of the public business, unless it can be clearly shown that such secrecy is absolutely esential from the standpoint of protecting the security of this Republic.

It is sometimes difficult to tell just where the line of demarcation falls. It becomes a matter of judgment.

I have complete confidence in the judgment of my President. I am completely satisfied that he will exercise his discretion wisely. I am of the opinion that no one among us is more determined to maintain the system of governmental checks and balances than is the President of the United States.

It is my advice, and will continue to be my advice, in any report that I make to the President in regard to the Cuban matter, that he tell the American people everything they can be told, consonant with the security of our country, in regard to the Cuban invasion attempt, going back for more than a year, during the Eisenhower administration.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to another matter. I have a series of amendments that I propose to submit to the mutual aid bill, and I want to comment on each one of them.

The first is a very brief amendment. It reads:

It is the sense of Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment under the Organization of American States of an international military force.

Mr. President, this is no new amendment. I have not had an opportunity to talk to the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. GORE] about the amendment, because it is one that the Senator from Tennessee supported in other terms, and which I supported in other terms.

I indicated in the Foreign Relations Committee the other day that I was going to offer this amendment. I become more and more convinced that it is a mistake for us to seek to handle the matter of hemispheric defense almost alone, as we are doing now, on the basis of bilateral military agreements, arrangements, and understandings entered into between individual Latin American countries and the United States.

That relationship constantly arises to plague us.

The history of Latin America in recent years shows that too frequently things go awry in some Latin American country, and then it is pointed out that we have given a great deal of military aid to that country. So we get branded as a sort of collusive ally with the regime that has become highly unpopular; and, unfortunately, too many times it has become unpopular for good cause.

This also gives rise, as shall be seen, to another amendment which I shall submit shortly, involving the whole problem of aid for internal security. It is a pretty difficult line to draw. Where does the military aid to a country, necessary to protect itself from external aggression, stop, and aid necessary for internal security begin?

Furthermore, as many of our Latin American friends who have advised with my committee will point out, if aid is given for so-called hemispheric defense, can it be doubted that if internal trouble should develop in a country, such aid is going to be used to suppress it?

They point out that that has been the pattern. I am not saying that we can end all aid on the basis of bilateral arrangements between the United States and the various countries of Latin America for hemispheric defense, nor am I saying that we can end all aid on the basis of bilateral arrangements between the United States and various Latin American countries for internal security purposes. But I am saying that this problem of hemispheric defense is one of hemispheric responsibility. It is not a responsibility which rests solely upon the United States. In my judgment, it is a responsibility which rests primarily upon the Organization of American States.

The Organization of American States ought to function as a military alliance for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. We ought to recognize it, in that sense, as an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. The time has come in Western Hemispheric relations for all nations in the hemisphere pledged and devoted to freedom to work in concert for their mutual defense.

The more we make dominant in our military relationships with Latin American countries these bilateral arrangements for military aid to an individual country, allegedly for hemispheric defense, the more we shall raise the demands from their neighbors to get at least as much, if not more. Of course, Latin Americans will tell us this. It is typical throughout Latin America. They follow the old human practice of wanting to do as well as the Joneses. Therefore, if the United States gives aid to X country, Y country immediately would like at least as much, if not more, and prefers to have more, because it gives a feeling of being in a preferred position.

We have had some very sad and sometimes almost ludicrous situations develop in respect to the competitive struggle in Latin America for more and more military aid based on the allegation that it was needed for hemispheric defense.

Although we shall have to continue these bilateral arrangements to some extent, I think the time is upon us when we ought to look to the Organization of American States to start doing some policing of its own, so far as hemispheric defense is concerned.

Therefore, I propose to continue the movement in the Senate which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been so instrumental in putting forward. I shall be delighted, of course, to have the Senator as a cosponsor of the amendment, if he cares to be one, or, for that matter, to be its principal sponsor, with me as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the amendment lie on the desk until 5 o'clock tomorrow, to give the Senator from Tennessee or any other Senator who may wish to cosponsor it an opportunity to cosponsor it. I should like to have the amendment printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues can read the amendment. That is within my parliamentary rights, and in no way prevents cosponsorship tomorrow, because the amendment will not be officially printed by the Government Printing Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, after line 22, add the following new paragraph:

It is the sense of the Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment under the Organization of American States of an international military force.

Mr. MORSE. I have only one additional comment, Mr. President, about the amendment. If we could start the development of a Western Hemispheric police force, under the sponsorship and authority of the Organization of American States, it would have many good effects. There are two I wish to mention.

In the first place, it would help resolve some of the problems which confront us with regard to arms for internal security, because the more we succeed in having the Latin American countries work on an alliance or teamwork basis with regard to protecting the security of the hemisphere, the more we shall find they will resolve some of the internal security problems at the same time. However, more important is the fact that the adoption of this policy would really make something of the Organization of American States.

I wish to say, most respectfully, the Organization of American States needs to be greatly strengthened. It needs to become a more effective parliamentary alliance instrumentality in the Western Hemisphere for a mutual resolving of hemispheric problems.

I think there is great merit in the amendment, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration in the Foreign Relations Committee and favorable consideration in the Senate.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk another amendment which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, and to have printed and appropriately referred immediately.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 30, after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. 511. Restrictions on military aid to Latin America. (a) The value of programs of defense articles for American Republics, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1961, shall not exceed $55,000,000.

"(b) Internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise, be the basis for military assistance programs for American Republics."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment is on the subject of restrictions on military aid to Latin America.

This has become an exceedingly controversial subject matter in the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. Speaking most respectfully, I am at a complete loss to understand why the administration would propose to change the existing law in respect to the two matters covered by my amendment.

For some years there was considerable discussion and many debates on this subject matter in the Senate. It was a hot issue in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Finally, the committee recommended and the Senate adopted a ceiling on military aid to Latin America. We not only did that but we also provided that internal security requirements should not, unless the President determined otherwise, be the basis for military assistance programs for American Republics.

Now the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and his generals have come to the Congress with what is represented to be the administration's bill proposing to do away with the ceiling and proposing to require no longer the specific passing of judgment upon this matter of arms for internal security by the President of the United States.

I say on the floor of the Senate, as some of my colleagues are reported in the press to have said publicly elsewhere, that this proposal of the administration is in trouble.

As I said to a representative of the administration the other day in the Committee on Foreign Relations, even assuming—and I do not so assume—that a bare majority vote can be obtained in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for lifting the ceiling and doing away with the specific requirement that

the President must pass judgment upon any aid to any Latin-American country for internal security, that victory would be won at too dear a price, because any such victory would destroy an enthusiasm and confidence of at least several members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as to what the administration is up to in Latin America.

I say most respectfully to the President of the United States, "You had better tell your generals that sometimes it is good military strategy to retreat to a stronger line of defense."

I have worked in the field of Latin America for some years. I wish to say for the benefit of the President of the United States that in my judgment if he insists upon his proposal to lift the ceiling in regard to American military aid to Latin America, we will pay dearly in many parts of Latin America so far as America's prestige is concerned, and we shall play directly into the hands of the Communists throughout Latin America. We will give them more fuel for their propaganda machines. I am at a loss to understand why the Pentagon, where the real responsibility for the proposed program rests, should advance any such proposal as this one.

Everyone knows that if we ever get into a war with Russia, the amount of money that is proposed for military aid to Latin America will not be of much help to us anyway. That aid will not win a nuclear war. If we get into a war with Russia, the defense of the nations of Latin America will be completely dependent upon the United States. They will be completely dependent upon the nuclear power of the United States. They do not belong to the nuclear club. Latin America cannot be of any help in a nuclear war with Russia.

No one can tell me that the types of military equipment covered by the bill in respect to military aid to Latin America will be worth anything from the standpoint of the defense of this hemisphere in case of a nuclear war with Russia. We can take judicial notice that it will not be of any material help. So, in what kind of situation would there be need of some military aid to Latin America for hemispheric defense or for the kind of defense that would be necessary if one Latin American country should attack another? Judging from past history, we would not decrease the opportunities of such an occurrence by increasing military aid to Latin America.

I am not a military strategist, but when I listen to the generals from the Pentagon on this point I doubt that they are, either. More military aid to Latin America of the kind the generals are advocating will not decrease the possibility of difficulties between and among certain Latin American countries, but quite the contrary.

It is interesting to note that when we supply more ammunition, arms, and devices of military engagement, there are always those in Latin America who seem to find it difficult to resist the temptation to use them. So we have the Pentagon asking not for $55 million, which is the present ceiling, and which is the ceiling I would maintain, but their request adds up, in round numbers, to around $68 million.

What will the reaction in Latin America be? What will the reaction be in those countries whose futures are nip and tuck, when it is announced that we are going to give $68 million and not $55 million of military aid? The Communists will have a field day with that information.

Again, we should remember what we are dealing with in the battle of information in Latin America as to the legitimate aims of the United States and the legitimate aims of Russia and the other parts of the Communist world, including China.

The American people do not realize the stepup in program of the Red Chinese in many parts of Latin America. It is a stepup in an economic program. It is a stepup in technical assistance. It is a stepup in their Communist propaganda program. It is not a stepup in military aid. Perhaps what is needed in this field in the Pentagon is a new course in the War College on psychological warfare in Latin America. If there were a course in psychological warfare in Latin America, perhaps we could get some of the brass in the Pentagon to understand that it is not good psychology to be increasing the ceiling on military aid to Latin America.

I shall have more to say on this subject later when my amendment comes before the Senate for debate, because on this subject I serve notice on the administration that I will never go along with the lifting of the ceiling on military aid to Latin America. I am convinced it would not be in the interest of my country, and it would not be in the interest of the security of many countries in Latin America.

Also, I point out that in the past several days I have been consulted by a considerable number of diplomatic officials from Latin America who themselves cannot understand the lifting of the ceiling. But they are placed in a very embarrassing position. They cannot say, "Do not make that aid available to us," because they have their problems, too. I am satisfied that a great sigh of relief would sweep over Latin America if it were announced that the ceiling would stand.

A great deal has been said by the Pentagon about a training program. I am in favor of a training program. It is fine. I would like to see most or all of it spent for a training program, although the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has a suggestion to make to which I will refer in a moment.

Then it is pointed out that because of past bilateral agreements between the United States and certain countries, we have certain commitments that we must fulfill.

That is what we must watch so far as the Pentagon is concerned. It is an old story of the Pentagon. I believe I have heard it for 17 years. Every year when we get to military appropriations, skies become full of clouds and crises. More crises can develop at the time of appropriations in Congress than at any other time during the year. This great Pentagon lobby is masterful in frightening people. We must get ready for a great many crises in print.

Mr. President, we cannot justify many of the bilateral agreements for military aid for hemispheric defense in Latin America. However, we are stuck with them. I do not want to get stuck with more. I do not want to give the Pentagon some $13 million more to get us involved in more bilateral agreements for military aid to Latin America. I would like to reduce what we already have just as fast as it is possible to do so. Certainly, I am not going to vote to increase the ceiling or to do away with the ceiling.

We reinforced it a little the other day. One of our Democratic Party officials on the committee made it perfectly clear that he was not buying their argument. So we got a little retreat there. Then it was said that we might give some consideration to keeping the ceiling but increasing the amount. That did not fool me. I do not want to change the ceiling and I do not want to change the amount. I will not vote for either.

When we are talking about the training program, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made the suggestion that we may be able to present American military aid in a more acceptable program in Latin America, to really help strengthen the security of Latin America from the hemispheric defense standpoint, if we gave some military aid in conformity with our program for the Army Engineers in this country. I thought it was a splendid idea. I do not know how much of it we could channel into that program of aid.

However, if, in connection with the military training program under which these countries send some of their best officer material to the United States for training in the war colleges and other military establishments, we could funnel some more of this money into an engineer program which will assist them, for example, in Army engineering projects, harbor development, road development, and development of dams and public works necessary to protect the security of a country; in many places in Latin America, it would be more beneficial to their security than to send them an obsolete destroyer or a great deal of obsolete military equipment, or even modern conventional military equipment outside the nuclear field. That would certainly put American military aid in a different light in Latin America.

The Senate must give consideration to this question when we come to vote on whether we are to do away with the ceiling and increase the amount. If we accept the administration request, I am perfectly willing to predict and prophesy tonight it will be a much more serious retreat for the American military than will be the case if they accept the retreat of just letting this law stand the way it is, which has in it the $55 million ceiling and which has in it the language that requires the President to determine whether any military aid upon the basis of a specific request shall be used for internal security reasons.

I hope the Senate will not fall for the bureaucratic argument which the Pen-

tagon frequently uses: "The President is too busy." I do not know of anything that is more important in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States than to review any request for American military aid for internal security in any Latin American country. Certainly all the research work, and all the paper work, and all the analyses can be prepared in advance. They can come in and present their case. The President, being the highly intelligent man that he is, is not going to take very long to reach his judgment. He did not sit on the Committee on Foreign Relations for some years and with us on the floor of the Senate not to be fully aware of the techniques of the Pentagon when it seeks to get through Congress the legislation it wants.

I say again to the President, most respectfully: "Do not let them maneuver you into this position of where the question as to whether or not military aid for internal security is going to be granted to any Latin American country will depend on the determination of the Secretary of Defense and his advisers and the general staff of the Pentagon."

Have we not learned anything from our past aid for so-called internal security? Have we not learned yet that the use of American arms for such purposes in the past in Latin America has caused governments to topple and has created one of the major arguments used against us as the imperialist of the north? When are we going to learn? I almost give up hope so far as the Pentagon is concerned. I know the White House will. The White House should not make this mistake on the advice of the Pentagon.

To the contrary, the President ought to give to the American people the assurance that they can rely upon him to pass judgment upon any specific request for American arms for purposes allegedly of maintaining internal security in any Latin American country.

Oh, I know, there will be much said about, "Well, you have the Cuban threat, and you will have to give them some arms because of the Cuban threat."

If we come to this matter, in connection with my first amendment, whereby the Organization of American States will start performing some of the functions it ought to perform in regard to internal security in Latin America, and then meet the Cuban threat head on through this wonderful program that President Kennedy calls the Alliance for Progress, Castro will not make any headway in Latin America.

The security of Latin America, may I say, is not going to be maintained by American arms. The security of Latin America is only going to be maintained by the United States cooperating with its Latin American neighbors through the Alliance for Progress program, by helping the mass of the people of Latin America receive the economic benefits that they must receive if we are going to win the battle for progress in Latin America. It is as simple as that.

Either we must do something about the stomachs of Latin America, or else we will lose the minds of Latin America. We shall not help the stomachs of Latin America by sending more bullets. We must face the fact that for some decades to come we shall face the problem of people in Latin America insisting upon a better way of life. If we do not support the procedures of freedom in Latin America, then we shall be playing right into the hands of revolutionary forces, some of them anti-Communist, some of them Communist. The task is not pleasant; it is not easy.

Mr. President, it is not by choice that I speak about some of the ugly realities which face us in Latin American relations. Nevertheless, the realities are there. I say again, most respectfully, that the Pentagon has demonstrated, in the testimony I have heard concerning this matter, that it does not comprehend the problem. It simply does not comprehend the problem.

Mr. President, this is a little preview of the debate in which I propose to participate before final action is taken on this subject. I yield to no Secretary of Defense, and I yield to no general, I do not care how many stars he has on his shoulders, in my dedication to protecting the security of my country in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. The security of the United States will not be strengthened by American military aid in any such amounts as the Pentagon is recommending, either for military aid for hemispheric defense or military aid for internal security. Certainly our security will not be strengthened by leaving the impression throughout Latin America that we are so determined to be on the military march in that area that now we do not even require the President to review the decisions of the Pentagon for military aid and for internal security in Latin America.

I am very sad about this section of the foreign-aid bill. I sincerely hope that upon reflection the administration will change its course and make it even unnecessary to press for action on my amendment either in committee or on the floor of the Senate. It could do that very easily.

One more comment on this particular amendment. This battle was won in the Senate. This proposal on the President's review is a victory won here only 2 or 3 years ago. Can anyone tell me what has happened in Latin America that would justify going back to the status quo? We shall not make any progress in Latin America by sitting on our status quos. We shall make progress in Latin America by getting behind the President on his Alliance for Progress program. That is the way to win the battle for freedom in Latin America.

I respectfully urge the Senate to give careful consideration to the proposals of some of us—and I shall not be alone on the Committee on Foreign Relations on this subject—calling for the rejection of what I consider to be the very unwise recommendations of the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I turn to my next amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 26 designate the language in section 506 as "(a)", redesignate the subordinate paragraphs accordingly, and on page 27, after line 19, add subsection 506(b) reading "It shall be a condition of eligibility that the President be satisfied that a nation is adequately taxing itself to support its military establishment."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it has been pointed out in some of our past reports on Latin America that one of the national pastimes in many parts of that region is to make tax payments at least negotiable, if not to engage in tax evasion.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I were the two Senate delegates to the Conference of Bogotá We worked shoulder to shoulder with that great statesman of our country, now the Secretary of the Treasury, then the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Douglas Dillon. As Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon performed magnificently at that conference in making it clear that the Latin American countries had to be willing to help themselves if they were to expect help from the taxpayers of the United States.

We pointed out in that conference that one of the best ways for Latin American countries to help themselves would be for the governments to start to enforce reasonable tax programs based upon ability to pay. Many countries in Latin America are asking for military aid, but they do not have an effective income tax. Many countries of Latin America are asking for huge sums for military aid, but their wealthy citizens do not even invest in the future potentialities of their own country and their own people the profits they skim off the economy of their country; they invest them in New York and Swiss banks.

Mr. President, that practice will have to stop. The Pentagon was quite surprised when I raised this question the other day in committee and asked for any information they might have as to the tax structures of the countries for which they are recommending that Congress provide larger appropriations for military aid. There are no economists or tax experts of renown at the Pentagon, but I should have thought that, at least, someone would have done his bookwork and that the Pentagon would have been able to give us some information as to the extent to which the countries of Latin America have been willing to tax themselves to help pay for some of their own military needs.

Mr. President, this is one of the reforms which the countries of Latin America must adopt if they expect to look to us to cooperate with them through the Alliance for Progress. Therefore, before I vote, and before I think the Senate should vote, on military aid to any specific country in such amounts as the Pentagon is asking for, we should examine the tax structure of that country and determine how much money it is willing to tax its own people, and how much it is willing to contribute to its own defense. We simply

cannot continue this pace of providing largess out of the goodness of the American people. We cannot afford it at the rate at which we are spending money. Therefore, I shall press for action on this amendment.

Mr. President, I submit my last amendment on which I shall comment. I ask that it be appropriately referred and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 18, add the following: "The number of such persons shall be reduced 10 percent below the number on January 1, 1961, and shall be held at that level."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment is an economy measure. Yes, it is more than an economy measure. Sometimes I think some of the personnel which are sent to some parts of the world are greater in number than is needed to do the job which should be done, and the resulting impression is not favorable to the United States. I think this is a very sound amendment from that standpoint, and I hope it will be favorably considered.

Mr. President, for the benefit of those who might seek to read into my remarks motives, intentions, and meanings which I do not possess, I have made this speech this evening because I consider it timely, in view of the work that the subcommittee of which I am chairman has been doing in the field of Latin American affairs. I consider it timely because I believe these statements need to be made before opinion crystallizes in the Senate on the mutual aid bill.

Mr. President, I am well aware—as a result of my experience in the past with mutual-aid bills—that during the consideration in the Senate of mutual security bills, the point is reached where Senators crystallize their judgment. They make up their minds; and then it is very difficult to permeate beyond that crystallization, and persuade them to change their minds. Their votes become set.

I plead with them not to make up their minds yet in regard to this mutual aid bill. I plead with them not to form any set opinions on this bill until they examine the evidence—which will be forthcoming from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that I believe will be such that fair judgment will cause them to decide that any doubts they may have should be resolved in favor of the position I have taken on the several amendments I have submitted this afternoon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 20, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1619) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless the minority leader has other business for the Senate today, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward T. Wailes, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

William P. Snow, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

JUDICIARY

Roger J. Kiley, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit, vice W. Lynn Parkinson, deceased.

William Harold Cox, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi, vice a new position.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Bernard J. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Daniel H. Jenkins.

Frank R. Freeman, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Dale M. Green.

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice John Strickler.

U.S. MARSHALS

James J. Moos, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Gilbert B. Scheller.

Orville H. Trotter, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Clark W. Gregory.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 113: 3: *From the rising of the sun, unto the going down of the same the Lord's name is to be praised.*

Our Heavenly Father, may our hearts daily expand and enlarge with praise and penitence as we think of how marvelous are the works of Thy hand and how merciful are the wonders of Thy grace.

Purge us of the moods of pessimism and cynicism, of despair and defeatism and may they be supplanted by the pressures of noble aspirations, impelling us to dedicate ourselves anew to the great concerns of humanity and the vast national and international problems and issues which are still unsettled and unsolved.

Help us to believe that the anxious and restless feelings which come over us, during these days are perhaps divinely intended to turn our prodigal minds and hearts back and nearer to Thee that we may have a richer and more satisfying experience of Thy love and find the secret of conquest and peace.

To Thy name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: On title I, Messrs. FALLON, DAVIS of Tennessee, BLATNIK, SCHERER, and CRAMER; on title II, Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, O'BRIEN of Illinois, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARSHA. 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. 87]

Adair	Grant	Powell
Alger	Green, Oreg.	Reifel
Auchincloss	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, Alaska
Baring	Harrison, Va.	Roberts
Betts	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Blitch	Inouye	Rousselot
Burke, Ky.	Kilburn	Santangelo
Cederberg	Laird	Scherer
Celler	McSween	Shelley
Diggs	Macdonald	Siler
Evins	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Findley	May	Thompson, N.J.
Fino	Michel	Williams
Flynt	Moore	Wright
Gavin	Norrell	Young
Giaimo	Poage	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Highway Investigating Committee of the Committee on Public