quietly but effectively. Two hundred of the five hundred largest cities in the Southern and border States—nearly half of them—have taken affirmative action on local public accommodations problems. Right here in Miami, outstanding progress has been made in a short time by the efforts of ministers and medical society members and department store owners and county commissioners and union leaders.

The trust of public leaders will not be kept by exploiting the issue for partisan ends or discouraging its resolution for personal advantage.

American politics must not be less responsible than the electorate it serves. There can be no Democratic answer or Republican answer, no White House answer or State House answer, no 1964 answer or 1968 answer—but only a responsible American answer achieved by all of us, at all levels, working together all of the time for and with the people.

Let us all recognize this one thing: While the Negro has long been the object of studied neglect, many of the conditions he protests today are blind to color. If the Negro is now the first victim, he will not be the last if we fail to cure the ills within our society—of underemployment, undereducation, underdevelopment of our potential, underuse of our productive capacity.

We are moving now with a favoring wind behind us—in the world and at home. If we are to resolve these problems within our society, we must act now before those winds fall—or change to blow against us.

In response to the challenge before our Nation now, some say "Now"—others say "Never." But the clear response of the American majority is "Together"—together, for there is no other way.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 29, 1963

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

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

O Lord and Master of us all, whatever our name or sign, before we plunge into the baffling confusion and thorny problems within the walls of this Chamber drenched with history, here at the hearthstone of Thy mercy we would renew our inner strength, for collectively and individually we stand in need of courage and fortitude and stability.

We come to Thee, soiled by the world's common life, with all its delusive allurement, and in dire need of Thy cleansing grace.

In preparation for the weighty responsibilities Thy servants here must face in this and the coming weeks, may they be stripped of pride and made humbly receptive to Thy will.

May the temporary triumph of party and the transient success of our individual desires be surrendered to the true welfare of the Commonwealth.

As we thus pray at noontide of this new day, come down Thine own secret stairway to our own deepest needs, as we open our hearts to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 25, 1963, 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 July 25, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of peanuts which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Breskin, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1122. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.;

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY IN THE EXECUTIVE ELEMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of June 30, 1963, there was an aggregate of 2,192 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps (2-year program), and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMORTIZATION OF CERTAIN FIXED ASSETS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the amortization of fixed assets of the Panama Canal Company that are classified as nondepreciable (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 24 OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON REAL ESTATE LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) relating to certain limitations on real estate loans by national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ENTITLED "OCEANOGRAPHY: THE 10 YEARS AHEAD"

A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Oceanography: The 10 Years Ahead" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board's visit to the Academy, dated April 26, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON RESEARCH CRUISE OF RESEARCH VESSEL "CHAIN" TO THE EQUATORIAL ATLANTIC AND CARIBBEAN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the research cruise of the research vessel *Chain* to the equatorial Atlantic and Caribbean,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

during the period January 1 to June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON REFUGEE-ESCAPEES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on refugee-escapees, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY SCHEDULES

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of an additional section, to be added to a proposed draft of legislation for adjusting statutory salary schedules, transmitted under the date of May 16, 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, as amended, with regard to filing designation of beneficiary (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION —

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation consenting to the northeastern water and related land resources compact

"Whereas the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact provides a means for coordinated planning of resource development in New England with consequent benefit to the people of the region; and

"Whereas the compact has been entered into and enacted into law by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island and requires only approval by the Congress to become effective: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation consenting to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, July 15, 1963.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk.*

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, July 17, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 20

"*Resolved (the Senate concurring)*, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Stewards of the First Methodist Church of Coral Gables, Fla., favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for Bible reading and prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Stephen K. Bailey, and 42 other members of the Maxwell Graduate Faculty of Syracuse University, of Syracuse, N.Y., relating to pending civil rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the Borough of Lavallettee, N.J., favoring the enactment of House bill 2585, requesting the Administration of Veterans Affairs to construct a new veterans' hospital in the southern part of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of June 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JUNE 1963 AND MAY 1963, AND PAY, MAY 1963 AND APRIL 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for June 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In June numbered—	In May numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In May was—	In April was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,509,028	2,491,848	+17,180	$1,363,047	$1,310,613	$52,434
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,459,004	1,437,535	+21,469	776,506	750,107	26,399
Department of Defense	1,050,024	1,054,313	−4,289	586,541	560,506	26,035
Inside the United States	2,346,255	2,322,809	−23,446			
Outside the United States	162,773	169,039	−6,266			
Industrial employment	564,887	561,345	+3,542			
Foreign nationals	163,617	164,665	−1,048	27,612	28,017	−405

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963; and pay for May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	June	May	Increase	Decrease	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	115,115	105,985	9,130		$54,675	$50,340	$4,335	
Commerce	32,358	30,971	1,387		20,443	20,227	216	
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,063	78,564	2,499		43,054	41,342	1,712	
Interior	72,549	[1] 70,413	2,136		39,113	[1] 36,469	2,644	
Justice	32,081	31,649	432		22,043	21,124	919	
Labor	9,581	9,247	334		5,806	5,689	117	
Post Office	587,161	584,217	2,944		287,938	284,221	3,717	
State [2] [3]	42,428	42,018	410		22,854	21,718	1,136	
Treasury	86,579	88,082		1,503	54,536	52,930	1,606	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963; and pay for May 1963, and comparison with April 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	June	May	Increase	Decrease	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	388	375	13		$284	$260	$24	
Bureau of the Budget	514	477	37		445	397	48	
Council of Economic Advisers	61	42	19		38	32	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	75	2		48	37	11	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	29	1		27	27		
National Security Council	39	39			35	34	1	
Office of Emergency Planning	477	439	38		391	366	25	
Office of Science and Technology	68	46	22		32	32		
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	10	16		6	3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	36	33	3		24	23	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	422	421	1		92	85	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,121	7,038	83		5,651	5,388	263	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	622	606	16		428	405	23	
Civil Aeronautics Board	851	827	24		683	649	34	
Civil Service Commission	4,085	4,040	45		2,675	2,571	104	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	5		$1
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	79	74	5		53	53		
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	287	13		257	203	54	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238			183	187		4
Federal Aviation Agency	46,337	45,949	388		33,150	31,101	2,049	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,515	1,416	99		1,067	1,022	45	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,236	1,252		16	868	819	49	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,231	21		883	842	41	
Federal Maritime Commission	251	238	13		188	175	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	398	390	8		366	347	19	
Federal Power Commission	1,218	1,127	91		860	831	29	
Federal Trade Commission	1,177	1,147	30		881	832	49	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	144	132	12		78	66	12	
General Accounting Office	4,647	4,504	143		3,157	3,019	138	
General Services Administration	32,652	32,212	440		16,745	15,421	1,324	
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78		4,524	4,261	263	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,160	13,991	169		9,427	8,847	580	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,427	2,384	43		1,767	1,696	71	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,937	28,013	1,924		22,888	23,662		774
National Capital Housing Authority	453	455		2	219	210	9	
National Capital Planning Commission	69	63	6		41	43		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	86	81	5		62	61	1	
National Gallery of Art	315	308	7		148	140	8	
National Labor Relations Board	1,982	1,987		5	1,498	1,430	68	
National Mediation Board	143	140	3		130	114	16	
National Science Foundation	1,099	961	138		690	631	59	
Panama Canal	14,966	15,036		70	5,144	5,166		22
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	52	4		38	35	3	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,995	1,964	31		1,173	1,120	53	
Renegotiation Board	223	211	12		191	182	9	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	165		2	104	104		
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,388	1,367	21		1,005	967	38	
Selective Service System	6,916	6,933		17	2,369	2,254	115	
Small Business Administration	3,387	3,266	121		2,272	2,161	111	
Smithsonian Institution	1,615	1,440	175		786	732	54	
Soldiers' Home	1,073	1,085		12	372	352	20	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	20	27		7	22	22		
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	26		1	22	22		
Tariff Commission	288	267	21		212	205	7	
Tax Court of the United States	157	154	3		127	123	4	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,075	17,979	96		11,533	11,253	280	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	153	139	14		145	105	40	
U.S. Information Agency	11,793	11,691	102		5,334	5,249	85	
Veterans' Administration	172,903	173,139		236	83,976	79,430	4,546	
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466	194	204		10
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,459,004	1,437,535	23,812	2,343	776,506	750,107	27,212	813
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			21,469				$26,399	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,247	2,190	57		1,805	1,737	68	
Department of the Army	375,933	379,092		3,159	203,023	195,009	8,014	
Department of the Navy	343,971	341,999	1,972		200,583	190,779	9,804	
Department of the Air Force	296,982	299,942		2,960	164,554	156,897	7,657	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,006	2,018		12	1,072	1,015	57	
Defense Communications Agency	572	567	5		293	369		76
Defense Supply Agency	25,032	25,314		282	13,106	12,721	385	
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,058	75		920	867	53	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1	36	36		
Interdepartmental activities	12	14		2	9	9		
International military activities	59	59			41	44		3
Armed Forces information and education activities	421	422		1	228	216	12	
Classified activities	1,617	1,598	19		871	807	64	
Total Department of Defense	1,050,024	1,054,313	2,128	6,417	586,541	560,506	26,114	79
Net change, Department of Defense			4,289				$26,035	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [4 5]	2,509,028	2,491,848	25,940	8,760	1,363,047	1,310,613	53,326	892
Net increase, including Department of Defense			17,180				$52,434	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] June figure includes 16,782 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,690 in May and their pay. These AID figures include employees paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The June figure includes 4,689 of these trust fund employees and the May figure includes 4,232.

[3] June figure includes 1,121 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,038 in May and their pay.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[5] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	June	May	Change
Agriculture Department	3,291	5,268	−1,977
Interior Department	3,681	7,365	−3,684
Tennessee Valley Authority	158	148	+10
Veterans' Administration	39	144	−105
Department of the Army	242	642	−400
Total	−7,411	13,567	−6,156

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	113,921	104,643	9,278	
Commerce	31,692	30,311	1,381	
Health, Education, and Welfare	80,439	77,957	2,482	
Interior	72,028	[1] 69,818	2,210	
Justice	31,723	31,294	429	
Labor	9,478	9,137	341	
Post Office	585,710	582,756	2,954	
State [2] [3]	10,868	10,651	217	
Treasury	85,949	87,453		1,504
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	388	375	13	
Bureau of the Budget	514	477	37	
Council of Economic Advisers	61	42	19	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	75	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	29	1	
National Security Council	39	39		
Office of Emergency Planning	477	439	38	
Office of Science and Technology	68	46	22	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	10	16		6
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	36	33	3	
American Battle Monuments Commission	6	6		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,088	7,006	82	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	622	606	16	
Civil Aeronautics Board	850	826	24	
Civil Service Commission	4,081	4,036	45	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	79	74	5	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	287	13	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238		
Federal Aviation Agency	45,289	44,906	383	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,513	1,414	99	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,234	1,250		16
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,231	21	
Federal Maritime Commission	251	238	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	398	390	8	
Federal Power Commission	1,218	1,127	91	
Federal Trade Commission	1,177	1,147	30	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	100	90	10	
General Accounting Office	4 551	4,415	136	
General Services Administration	32,639	32,199	440	
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,970	13,801	169	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,427	2,384	43	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,926	28,002	1,924	
National Capital Housing Authority	453	455		2
American Battle Monuments, etc.—Con.				
National Capital Planning Commission	69	63	6	
National Capital Transportation Agency	86	81	5	
National Gallery of Art	315	308	7	
National Labor Relations Board	1,949	1,954		5
National Mediation Board	143	140	3	
National Science Foundation	1,085	947	138	
Panama Canal	169	166	3	
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	52	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,995	1,964	31	
Renegotiation Board	223	211	12	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	165		2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,388	1,367	21	
Selective Service System	6,765	6,781		16
Small Business Administration	3,331	3,210	121	
Smithsonian Institution	1,598	1,423	175	
Soldiers' Home	1,073	1,085		12
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	20	27		7
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	26		1
Tariff Commission	288	267	21	
Tax Court of the United States	157	154	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,074	17,978	96	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	153	139	14	
U.S. Information Agency	3,304	3,236	68	
Veterans' Administration	171,910	172,143		233
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,394,765	1,372,784	23,785	1,804
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			26,981	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,183	2,124	59	
Department of the Army	327,072	327,223		151
Department of the Navy	319,686	317,511	2,175	
Department of the Air Force	271,706	272,129		423
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,006	2,018		12
Defense Communications Agency	546	537	9	
Defense Supply Agency	25,032	25,314		282
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,058	75	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	40		1
Interdepartmental activities	11	13		2
International military activities	38	38		
Armed Forces information and education activities	421	422		1
Classified activities	1,617	1,598	19	
Total, Department of Defense	951,490	950,025	2,337	872
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,465	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,346,255	2,322,809	26,122	2,676
Net increase, including Department of Defense			23,446	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] June figure includes 2,731 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,740 in May.
[3] June figure includes 758 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 681 in May.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,194	1,342		148
Commerce	666	660	6	
Health, Education, and Welfare	624	607	17	
Interior	521	595		74
Justice	358	355	3	
Labor	103	110		7
Post Office	1,451	1,461		10
State [1] [2]	31,560	31,367	193	
Treasury	630	629	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	416	415	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	33	32	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	4	4		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,048	1,043	5	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	44	42	2	
General Accounting Office	96	89	7	
General Services Administration	13	13		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	190	190		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	11		
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	14	14		
Panama Canal	14,797	14,870		73
Selective Service System	151	152		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	56	56		
Smithsonian Institution	17	17		
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,489	8,455	34	
Veterans' Administration	993	996		3
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,239	64,751	270	782
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			512	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	64	66		2
Department of the Army	48,861	51,869		3,008
Department of the Navy	24,285	24,488		203
Department of the Air Force	25,276	27,813		2,537
Defense Communications Agency	26	30		4
Interdepartmental Activities	1	1		
International Military Activities	21	21		
Total, Department of Defense	98,534	104,288		5,754
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,754	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	162,773	169,039	270	6,536
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			6,266	

[1] June figure includes 14,051 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,950 in May. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The June figure includes 4,689 of these trust fund employees and the May figure includes 4,232.
[2] June figure includes 363 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 357 in May.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,951	3,851	100	
Commerce	5,858	5,568	290	
Interior	9,532	8,748	784	
Post Office	257	254	3	
Treasury	5,194	5,187	7	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	276	256	20	
Federal Aviation Agency	3,037	3,060		23
General Services Administration	1,721	1,740		19
Government Printing Office	7,214	7,136	78	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	29,937	28,013	1,924	
Panama Canal	7,466	7,589		123
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	159	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,805	14,800	5	
Virgin Islands Corporation	721	1,187		466
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,131	87,548	3,214	631
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			2,583	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,987	[2] 137,883	104	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,394	[2] 4,665		271
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,513	195,446	2,067	
Outside the United States	1,271	1,285		14
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	130,640	131,556		916
Outside the United States	1,130	1,120	10	
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,821	1,842		21
Total, Department of Defense	474,756	473,797	2,181	1,222
Net increase, Department of Defense			959	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	564,887	561,345	5,395	1,853
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,542	

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	June	May	June	May	June	May	June	May
Canada	35	33					35	33
Crete	63	62					63	62
England	2,990	3,031			123	115	2,867	2,916
France	21,260	20,932	17,550	17,571	11	11	3,699	3,350
Germany	79,262	80,075	67,179	67,828	85	86	11,998	12,161
Greece	250	250					250	250
Japan	51,306	51,513	18,220	18,391	14,553	14,468	18,533	18,654
Korea	6,202	6,206	6,202	6,206				
Morocco	1,642	1,958			751	753	891	1,205
Netherlands	52	52					52	52
Trinidad	555	553			555	553		
Total	163,617	164,665	109,151	109,996	16,078	15,986	38,388	38,683

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

THE MONTH OF JUNE 1963

Civilian employees

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of June totaling 2,509,028 compared with 2,491,848 in May. This was a net increase of 17,180 including a net decrease of 6,156 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,940		8,688
February	2,483,511	5,571	
March	2,485,738	2,227	
April	2,495,347	9,609	
May	2,491,848		3,499
June	2,509,028	17,180	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of June was 1,459,004, an increase of 21,469 as compared with the May total of 1,437,535. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in June was 1,050,024, a decrease of 4,289 as compared with 1,054,313 in May.

Civilian agencies reporting larger increases were Agriculture Department with 9,130, Post Office Department with 2,944, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 2,499, Interior Department with 2,136, National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 1,924, and Commerce Department with 1,387. The largest decrease was reported by Treasury Department with 1,503. Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury Department changes were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest increase in civilian employment was reported by the Navy Department with 1,972. The largest decreases were reported by the Army Department with 3,159 and the Air Force Department with 2,960.

Inside the United States, civilian employment increased 23,446, and outside the United States, civilian employment decreased 6,266. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in June totaled 564,887, an increase of 3,542.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Foreign nationals

The total of 2,509,028 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 163,617 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies during June who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in May was 164,655. A breakdown of this employment for June follows:

Foreign nationals

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	35			35
Crete	63			63
England	2,990		123	2,867
France	21,260	17,550	11	3,699
Germany	79,262	67,179	85	11,998
Greece	250			250
Japan	51,306	18,220	14,553	18,533
Korea	6,202	6,202		
Morocco	1,642		751	891
Netherlands	52			52
Trinidad	555		555	
Total	163,617	109,151	16,078	38,388

SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963, ENDED JUNE 30, 1963

There was a net increase of 12,533 in civilian employment by executive branch agencies of the Federal Government during fiscal year 1963 which ended June 30, 1963. The total at the end of the year was 2,509,028 as compared with 2,496,495 in June 1962.

Civilian and military agencies

There was an increase during the year of 32,115 in employment by civilian agencies of the Government, and a decrease of 19,582 in civilian employment by military agencies. Employment by civilian agencies at the year-end totaled 1,459,004 as compared with 1,426,889 a year ago. Civilian employment by military agencies totaled 1,050,024 as compared with 1,069,606 in June 1962.

Inside and outside the United States

There was an increase of 10,283 in employment within the United States by Federal executive agencies, and an increase of 2,250 in employment outside the United States. Employment inside the United States as of June 30, 1963, totaled 2,346,255 as compared with 2,335,972 a year ago. Employment outside the United States as of June 30, 1963, totaled 162,773 as compared with 160,523 a year ago.

Employment for the year is summarized as follows:

Federal civilian employment, June 1962–June 1963

	June 1962	June 1963	Increase or decrease
Total	2,496,495	2,509,028	+12,533
Civilian agencies	1,426,889	1,459,004	+32,115
Military agencies	1,069,606	1,050,024	−19,582
Inside the United States	2,335,972	2,346,255	+10,283
Outside the United States	160,523	162,773	+2,250

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of May 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, MAY 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 42d in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of May 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of May 1, 1963, totaled $14,281,659,162, and as of May 31, 1963, they totaled $14,199,994,358, a net decrease of $81,664,804 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,848,005,200	$5,838,070,100	−$9,935,100
Defense Production Act	1,500,918,000	1,500,410,200	−507,800
Supplemental-barter	1,327,935,503	1,331,724,514	+3,789,011
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,676,858,703	8,670,204,814	−6,653,889
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,154,449,936	5,078,707,963	−75,741,973
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	127,659,288	127,608,991	−50,297
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,282,109,224	5,206,316,954	−75,792,270
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	35,929,985	36,515,880	+585,895
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	184,878,436	185,856,386	+977,950
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	220,808,421	222,372,266	+1,563,845
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2,208,900	2,208,600	−300
National Industrial Reserve Act	93,224,500	91,807,300	−1,417,200
Total, machine tools	95,433,400	94,015,900	−1,417,500
Helium	6,449,414	7,084,424	+635,010
Total, all inventories	14,281,659,162	14,199,994,358	−81,664,804

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

The appendix to this report includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows.

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	435,153,900	436,195,600	+$1,041,700	do	861,311	863,515	+2,204		
Total	922,834,500	923,876,200	+1,041,700	do	1,990,300	1,992,504	+2,204	1,200,000	792,504
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain: Supplemental—barter	11,261,236	12,548,141	+1,286,905	do	37,697	42,033	+4,336	(2)	42,033
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short dry ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	11,524,168	11,775,508	+251,340	do	19,947	20,387	+440		
Total	32,012,168	32,263,508	+251,340	do	50,248	50,688	+440	70,000	(2)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	$2,637,600	$2,637,600		Short ton	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	5,924,830	5,924,711	−$119	do	23,662	23,662			
Total	8,562,430	8,562,311	−119	do	35,367	35,367		45,000	(3)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		Short dry ton	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,393,300	9,393,300		do	14,104	14,104		11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	6,727,635	6,727,616	−19	do	25,055	25,055			
Total	7,429,735	7,429,716	−19	do	26,622	26,622		(2)	26,622
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	87,724,621	88,179,044	+454,423	do	5,667,614	5,698,306	+30,692		
Total	119,817,621	120,272,044	+454,423	do	7,917,431	7,948,123	+30,692	2,600,000	5,348,123
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,559,800	78,552,500	−7,300	do	4,962,851	4,962,706	−145		
Supplemental—barter	45,365,900	45,365,900		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,925,700	123,918,400	−7,300	do	7,890,111	7,889,966	−145	6,400,000	1,489,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,770,200	9,770,200		Short ton	23,233	23,233			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	28,633,100	+5,893,600	do	11,321	11,372	+51		
Total	33,935,500	39,829,100	+5,893,600	do	37,097	37,148	+51	23,100	14,048
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	11,784,070	6,291,789	−5,492,281	do	101	54	−47	(2)	54
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,518,600	5,519,000	+400	do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,245,300	8,245,700	+400	do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	21,260,000	21,236,300	−23,700	do	10,829,640	10,817,585	−12,055		
Supplemental—barter	12,312,700	12,312,800	+100	do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	33,572,700	33,549,100	−23,600	do	18,278,629	18,266,574	−12,055	6,500,000	11,766,574
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	53,261,800	52,639,400	−622,400	do	204,864,895	201,842,565	−3,022,330	68,000,000	133,842,565
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816		22,000	6,816
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,286,800	12,286,800		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,442,795	21,442,800	+5	do	678,609	678,608	−1		
Total	33,729,595	33,729,600	+5	do	1,238,061	1,238,060	−1	475,000	763,060
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,765,600	264,674,200	−91,400	do	3,799,176	3,797,409	−1,767		
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,615,366	224,671,600	+56,234	do	1,543,114	1,543,114			
Total	525,260,866	525,225,700	−35,166	do	6,327,936	6,326,169	−1,767	2,700,000	3,626,169
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		Short dry ton	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,578,370	5,578,370		do	198,624	198,624			
Total	30,727,670	30,727,670		do	1,245,783	1,245,783		1,300,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,313,100	169,286,000	−27,100	Pound	76,768,118	76,746,986	−21,132		
Defense Production Act	52,074,600	52,074,600		do	25,194,122	25,194,122			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,556,700	223,529,600	−27,100	do	103,039,258	103,018,126	−21,132	19,000,000	84,018,126
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	16,240,200	15,856,800	−383,400	do	107,175,713	104,643,733	−2,531,980	(2)	104,643,733
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Columbium:									
National stockpile	$23,860,500	$23,928,900	+$68,400	Pound	7,488,954	7,487,499	−1,455		
Defense Production Act	50,255,500	50,255,500		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,200	+100	do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,915,100	74,983,600	+68,500	do	16,100,515	16,099,060	−1,455	1,900,000	14,199,060
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,407,200	522,655,900	+248,700	Short ton	1,008,375	1,008,336	−39		
Defense Production Act	61,148,700	60,801,100	−347,600	do	109,077	108,435	−642		
Supplemental—barter	8,207,614	8,198,600	−9,014	do	12,382	12,382			
Total	591,763,514	591,655,600	−107,914	do	1,129,834	1,129,153	−681	1,000,000	129,153
Cordage fibers, abaca: National stockpile	37,767,000	37,741,400	−25,600	Pound	149,842,510	149,737,510	−105,000	150,000,000	(3)
Cordage fibers, sisal: National stockpile	42,940,500	42,872,500	−68,000	do	317,265,126	316,649,462	−615,664	320,000,000	(3)
Corundum: National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite: Defense Production Act	7,548,000	7,242,300	−305,700	do	27,334	26,227	−1,107	(3)	26,227
Diamond dies: National stockpile	487,700	490,300	+2,600	Piece	15,856	16,057	+201	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,456,700	15,456,700		do	5,523,748	5,523,748			
Total	77,066,200	77,066,200		do	36,637,159	36,637,159		30,000,000	6,637,159
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,481,478	186,481,478		do	15,452,658	15,452,658			
Total	286,982,978	286,982,978		do	24,767,841	24,767,841		18,000,000	6,767,840
Diamond tools: National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(3)	64,178
Feathers and down: National stockpile	38,064,500	37,966,300	−98,200	Pound	9,187,880	9,164,188	−23,692	8,800,000	364,188
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton.	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental-barter	33,524,800	33,525,900	+1,100	do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,086,700	61,087,800	+1,100	do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,433	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,423	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,056,200	7,056,200			34,233	34,233			
Supplemental—barter	145,659	210,312	+64,653	do	1,268	1,857	+589		
Total	7,201,859	7,266,512	+64,653	do	35,501	36,090	+589	17,200	18,890
Graphite, natural, other, cyrstalline: National stockpile	1,896,400	1,896,400		do	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hyoscine: National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		2,100	(3)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,041,200	1,041,400	+200	do	994,920	994,920			
Total	5,123,200	5,123,400	+200	do	3,972,568	3,972,568		4,300,000	(3)
Iridium: National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings: National stockpile	3,982,600	4,055,500	+72,900	Piece	51,163,963	51,270,565	+106,602	57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite: National stockpile	811,600	811,600		Short dry ton	9,387	9,387		4,800	4,587
Lead:									
National stockpile	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act	1,980,700	1,790,900	−189,800	do	5,229	4,728	−501		
Supplemental—barter	78,281,300	78,282,200	+900	do	327,998	327,998			
Total	399,560,100	399,371,200	−188,900	do	1,383,597	1,383,096	−501	286,000	1,097,096

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	$131,228,100	$131,112,100	−$116,000	Short ton	180,769	180,602	−167	107,000	73,602
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		do	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,512,798	14,512,798		do	142,351	142,351			
Total	35,538,298	35,538,298		do	286,836	286,836		50,000	236,836
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	8,064,284	8,063,500	−784	do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,197,584	10,196,800	−784	do	146,914	146,914		30,000	116,914
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,841,500	6,840,800	−700	do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,974,100	6,973,400	−700	do	100,838	100,838		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,100	248,240,100		do	5,851,264	5,851,264			
Defense Production Act	176,710,900	176,710,900		do	3,056,771	3,056,771			
Supplemental—barter	233,176,289	234,006,134	+829,845	do	3,407,407	3,419,628	+12,221		
Total	658,127,289	658,957,134	+829,845	do	12,315,442	12,327,663	+12,221	6,800,000	5,527,663
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	23,485,700	23,485,700		do	145,525	145,525		110,000	35,525
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,644,200	27,631,200	−13,000	Pound	11,626,674	11,621,211	−5,463		
Defense Production Act	40,857,700	40,857,700		do	6,456,251	6,456,251			
Supplemental—barter	4,694,943	4,794,511	+99,568	do	1,429,538	1,459,476	+29,938		
Total	73,196,843	73,283,411	+86,568	do	19,512,463	19,536,938	+24,475	8,300,000	11,236,938
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,733,083	1,733,083			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	932,746	953,946	+21,200	do	95,535	97,996	+2,461		
Total	10,624,146	10,645,346	+21,200	do	1,931,299	1,933,760	+2,461	1,300,000	633,760
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,294	40,040,294			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,551	44,866,551		21,200,000	23,666,551
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,126	223,126		17,000	206,126
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,102,007	2,190,891	+88,884	do	1,793,712	1,870,499	+76,787		
Total	4,682,507	4,771,391	+88,884	do	4,872,774	4,949,561	+76,787	1,700,000	3,249,561
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	86,695,400	85,295,900	−1,399,500	do	81,793,112	80,516,745	−1,276,367	59,000,000	21,516,745
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,988,600	181,988,600		do	334,304,655	334,304,616	−39		
Defense Production Act	104,143,800	103,501,000	−642,800	do	110,258,946	109,289,693	−969,253		
Total	286,132,400	285,489,600	−642,800	do	444,563,601	443,594,309	−969,292	323,000,000	120,594,309
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	195,757	195,757		172,800	22,957
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Defense Production Act	177,300	177,300		do	7,884	7,884			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,426,500	14,426,500		do	745,819	745,819		340,000	405,819
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	4,739,300	4,739,300		Pound	26,330,769	26,330,769		(2)	26,330,769
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,3425
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,000	415,000		Pound	67,065	67,065		66,000	1,065

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	$69,060,700	$69,060,700		Short ton	5,601,481	5,601,481			
Supplemental—barter	3,128,684	3,128,700	+$16	do	232,252	232,252			
Total	72,189,384	72,189,400	+16	do	5,833,733	5,833,733		650,000	5,183,733
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	2,039,700	2,039,700		Ounce	1,768,377	1,768,377		1,600,000	168,377
Quinine:									
National stockpile	4,049,900	4,047,900	−2,000	do	6,399,732	6,399,732		(2)	6,399,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter	5,653,659	5,668,507	+14,848	do	6,848	6,948	+100		
Total	12,788,559	12,803,407	+14,848	do	16,890	16,990	+100	5,700	11,290
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,800	657,800		Pound	6,085,570	6,085,570		(2)	6,085,570
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,100	78,100		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	781,801,600	776,324,900	−5,476,700	Long ton	1,011,208	1,004,175	−7,033	750,000	254,175
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,592	17,410	−182		
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,823	47,641	−182	65,000	(2)
Rutile, chlorinator charge:									
Defense Production Act					7,052	7,052		(2)	7,052
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(2)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,070,500	1,070,500		do	156,518	156,518			
Total	1,827,600	1,827,600		do	253,618	253,618		400,000	(2)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,781,200	8,724,100	−57,100	do	17,516,046	17,402,027	−114,019	7,400,000	10,002,027
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,811,800	26,814,100	+2,300	do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,206,300	38,208,600	+2,300	do	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,916,400	1,865,800	−50,600	Pound	1,414,712	1,382,487	−32,225	970,000	512,487
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		120,000	(2)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,000,000	442,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	496,800	496,800		Short ton	1,274	1,274		300	974
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,000	231,000		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	10,905,500	10,981,000	+75,500	Pound	3,422,865	3,420,478	−2,387		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,661,000	20,736,500	+75,500	do	4,962,267	4,959,880	−2,387	2,420,000	2,539,880
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		Pound	848,574	848,574			
Supplemental—barter	16,905,351	17,130,658	+225,307	do	8,157,700	8,278,975	+121,275		
Total	16,947,351	17,172,658	+225,307	do	9,006,274	9,127,549	+121,275	(2)	9,127,549
Tin:									
National stockpile	822,438,700	820,601,400	−1,837,300	Long ton	338,241	337,486	−755		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	838,842,700	837,005,400	−1,837,300	do	345,746	344,991	−755	185,000	159,991
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,755,800	176,692,200	−63,600	Short ton	22,449	22,442	−7		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,853,500	208,789,900	−63,600	do	31,470	31,463	−7	(2)	31,463

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	$369,129,300	$369,127,900	−$1,400	Pound	120,072,509	120,071,339	−1,170		
Defense Production Act	318,770,700	318,770,700		do	78,186,563	78,186,563			
Supplemental—barter	18,648,200	18,648,200		do	5,762,319	5,762,319			
Total	706,548,200	706,546,800	−1,400	do	204,021,391	204,020,221	−1,170	50,000,000	154,020,221
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		do	15,730,893	15,730,893		2,000,000	13,730,893
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,939,800	11,939,800		Long ton	42,795	42,795		30,000	12,795
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,237,700	49,219,200	−18,500	do	199,003	198,928	−75	180,000	18,928
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,915,700	9,845,800	−69,900	do	39,314	39,037	−277	39,000	37
Zinc:									
National stockpile	364,339,400	364,339,400		Short ton	1,256,866	1,256,866			
Supplemental—barter	79,588,200	79,588,200		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	443,927,600	443,927,600		do	1,580,762	1,580,762		178,000	1,402,762
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(2)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	284,600	270,500	−14,100	do	4,810	4,571	−239	(2)	4,571
Total:									
National stockpile	5,848,005,200	5,838,070,100	−9,935,100						
Defense Production Act	1,500,918,000	1,500,410,200	−507,800						
Supplemental—barter	1,327,935,503	1,331,724,514	+3,789,011						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,676,858,703	8,670,204,814	−6,653,889						

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The present objectives represent quantities of materials estimated to be necessary in the event of a 3-year war in which oversea sources would not be available.

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$779,043,451	$693,927,586	−$85,115,865	Bushel	653,778,744	575,466,755	−78,311,989
Cotton, extra-long staple	4,350,336	4,350,336		Bale	15,865	15,865	
Cotton, upland	809,608,080	808,295,937	−1,312,143	do	4,683,675	4,676,156	−7,519
Peanuts, farmers' stock	8,883,533	7,365,034	−1,518,499	Pound	78,039,071	63,995,427	−14,043,644
Peanuts, shelled	6,003,860	8,165,174	+2,161,314	do	33,329,655	46,405,553	+13,075,898
Rice, milled	407,221	167,186	−240,035	Hundredweight	42,206	17,012	−25,194
Rice, rough	516,747	4,893,714	+4,376,967	do	96,914	907,491	+810,577
Wheat	2,294,444,155	2,305,695,156	+11,251,001	Bushel	1,153,265,642	1,156,480,749	+3,215,107
Bulgur	1,757,232	829,637	−927,595	Pound	32,403,285	15,308,649	−17,094,636
Total, basic commodities	3,905,014,615	3,833,689,760	−71,324,855				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	$24,096,835	$31,097,110	+$7,000,275	Bushel	27,975,270	35,541,601	+7,566,331
Grain sorghum	769,344,683	754,747,058	−14,597,625	do	702,009,752	689,309,139	−12,700,613
Honey	129,950	113,825	−16,125	Pound	1,037,746	910,259	−127,487
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	226,658,843	234,453,815	+7,794,972	do	388,423,220	402,506,460	+14,083,240
Butter oil	52,816,448	54,307,400	+1,490,952	do	65,647,136	67,562,608	+1,915,472
Cheese	25,136,983	20,722,635	−4,414,348	do	66,969,774	55,373,274	−11,596,500
Ghee	369,883	369,883		do	455,322	455,322	
Milk, dried	101,605,247	106,796,628	+5,191,381	do	684,870,473	723,467,953	+38,597,480
Oats	8,943,358	10,017,108	+1,073,750	Bushel	14,881,350	16,592,907	+1,711,557
Rye	540,353	1,305,104	+764,751	do	497,850	1,224,452	+726,602
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	1,209,642,583	1,213,930,566	+4,287,983				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry edible	3,113,188	3,701,469	+588,281	Hundredweight	485,985	543,610	+57,625
Cottonseed oil, refined	1,014,923	1,014,923		Pound	8,339,550	8,339,550	
Flaxseed	8,299,014	14,032,982	+5,733,968	Bushel	2,790,587	4,730,933	+1,940,346
Soybeans	12,425,839	4,286,019	−8,139,820	do	5,252,945	1,843,083	−3,409,862
Turpentine	433,546	433,546		Gallon	826,233	826,233	
Vegetable oil products	14,506,228	7,618,698	−6,887,530	Pound	79,015,507	41,457,220	−37,558,287
Total, other nonbasic commodities	39,792,738	31,087,637	−8,705,101				
Total, price support inventory	5,154,449,936	5,078,707,963	−75,741,973				

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, May 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	$103, 874, 843	$103, 874, 843		Bale	122, 955	122, 955	
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23, 784, 445	23, 734, 148	−$50, 297	do	47, 288	47, 188	−100
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	127, 659, 288	127, 608, 991	−50, 297	do	170, 243	170, 143	−100
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 282, 109, 224	5, 206, 316, 954	−75, 792, 270				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10, 023, 273	$10, 023, 273		10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1, 772, 582	1, 772, 521	−$61	(1)			
Radiological equipment	24, 134, 130	24, 720, 086	+585, 956	(1)			
Total	35, 929, 985	36, 515, 880	+585, 895				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	140, 767, 711	142, 210, 155	+1, 442, 444	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5, 420, 642	5, 420, 642		(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	37, 645, 897	37, 531, 514	−114, 383	Each	1, 930	1, 930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).	1, 044, 186	694, 075	−350, 111	(1)			
Total	184, 878, 436	185, 856, 386	+977, 950				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	220, 808, 421	222, 372, 266	+1, 563, 845				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$21, 700	$21, 400	−$300	Tool	4	7	+3
On lease	2, 144, 300	2, 144, 300		do	103	103	
On loan	42, 900	42, 900		do	7	7	
Total	2, 208, 900	2, 208, 600	−300		114	117	+3
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	84, 536, 200	82, 780, 700	−1, 755, 500	do	7, 774	7, 547	−227
On lease	27, 500	27, 500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	2, 036, 900	2, 036, 900		do	201	201	
On loan to school programs	6, 623, 900	9, 662, 200	+338, 300	do	1, 566	1, 648	+82
Total	93, 224, 500	91, 807, 300	−1, 417, 200		9, 542	9, 397	−145
Total, machine tools	95, 433, 400	94, 015, 900	−1, 417, 500		9, 656	9, 514	−142

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, May 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, May 1, 1963	End of month, May 31, 1963	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$351, 579	$357, 983	+$6, 404	Cubic foot	28, 600, 000	29, 100, 000	+500, 000
Stored underground	6, 097, 835	6, 726, 441	+628, 606	do	751, 600, 000	804, 500, 000	+52, 900, 000
Total, helium	6, 449, 414	7, 084, 424	+635, 010	do	280, 200, 000	833, 600, 000	+53, 400, 000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbian-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of May 31, 1963, totaled $14,199,994,358. This was a net decrease of $81,664,804 as compared with the May 1 total of $14,281,659,162.

Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, May 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$6,653,889	$8,670,204,814
Agricultural commodities	−75,792,270	5,206,316,954
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+1,563,845	222,372,266
Machine tools	−1,417,500	94,015,900
Helium	+635,010	7,084,424
Total	−81,664,804	14,199,994,358

These figures are from the May 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories, compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of May 31, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 23 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 29 materials, and 42 materials remained unchanged during May.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of May 31, 1963, totaled $5,838,070,100. This was a net decrease of $9,935,100 during the month. The largest decreases were $5,476,700 in rubber, $1,837,300 in tin, and $1,399,500 in molybdenum.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of May 31, 1963, totaled $1,500,410,200. This was a net decrease of $507,800. The largest increase was in aluminum, offset by decreases in nickel, copper, and cryolite.

Supplemental—barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of May 31 totaled $1,331,724,514. This was a net increase of $3,789,011. The largest increases were in beryl, aluminum oxide, manganese, and bauxite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.2 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during May were reported for corn and grain sorghum, partially offset by an increase in wheat in the price support inventory.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in radiological equipment and medical stocks; the machine tools inventories showed a net decrease; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during May.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated July 22, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1944. A bill for the relief of Constantinos N. Geranios (Konstantinos N. Geranios), his wife, Dionyssiak Nicholaou (Mouzak) Geranios, and their children, Nicholas K. Geranios and Demitre K. Geranios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1945. A bill to provide for the reservation of certain federally generated power for use in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1946. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1947. A bill to amend section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. 1948. A bill to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, to projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

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

S. 1949. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1950. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Commerce; and

S. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1952. A bill to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1953. A bill authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1954. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Yen and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1955. A bill for the relief of Mihailo Radosavljevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREFERENCE OF POWER FOR MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from time to time I have addressed the Senate on the wealth of natural resources that we have in Montana. The current discussion of this authorization bill and, more specifically, the Knowles project, give me cause to comment again on this situation. Water is considered by many to be the State's most important resource. The rivers of Montana have provided sites for some very important and successful hydroelectric power projects, both public and private. These generating facilities have supplied the energy to meet the local demands, but also have provided the additional incentive to bring into the State new industry and the resulting benefits. In addition, these projects have contributed to the overall generating scheme of the Columbia and Missouri River Basins.

Montana is an upstream State; and because of its developed and undeveloped reservoir sites, it contributes a great deal of power generation and flood control downstream. Montana is a State which is just beginning to flex its muscles in its transition from a largely rural State to one with growing metropolitan areas and potential industrial development. Many of us see low-cost hydroelectric power as one of the major instruments in this development. Therefore we have come to be sensitive about keeping a reasonable amount of the power generated at these large upstream projects for use within our own State, and not merely permit the energy and benefits to flow downstream.

This attitude may appear to be somewhat parochial—and if it is, I have no apologies to make; but I am sure that my colleagues here in the Senate find similar attitudes in each and every State. If they have a resource of which they are justly proud, they want to see that the major benefit is realized in their own immediate area. This statement is not being made without a full awareness of the problems that arise from regional development and cooperation. We live in a Federal system; and the interests of our sister States must be, and should be, considered. The people of Montana want to be placed on record as stating that they are willing to cooperate; but they will not stand idly by while their resources are drained off for the benefit of those downstream.

Mr. President, I now introduce, and send to the desk, proposed legislation which would give Montana a preference for at-site power and a portion of the benefits realized downstream at all new federally-constructed projects in Montana. The language is identical to that contained in Senate bill 3558, of the 87th Congress. I realize full well that it will be opposed in certain quarters of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, but it is a matter which should be discussed. It is a subject of considerable concern to the Montana

congressional delegation and—more importantly—to the people of Montana. In the instance of Knowles Dam, if it is to be built, then the people of Montana should realize most of the benefits. A preference as provided in my bill will establish these guarantees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this bill printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1945) to provide for the reservation of certain federally generated power for use in the State of Montana, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the at-site capability of power and energy generated at Federal projects now under construction or hereafter constructed within the State of Montana, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract within this reservation, shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana: *Provided,* That at-site capability of the Yellowtail project shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana hereunder in the same percentage as the waters of the Big Horn River are allocated to the State of Montana by subdivision 2, paragraph B, of article V of the Yellowstone River compact, consented to by the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 663).

SEC. 2. An equitable share of the increase in system firm power generated at downstream Federal projects by reason of the storage and release of water from Federal projects in Montana shall be reserved for use in the State of Montana. In determining said reservation there shall be considered, among other relevant factors, machine capacity, amounts of water, and transmission facilities utilized in distributing and marketing the system firm power. Portions of the reservation made pursuant to this section not required to meet Montana loads under contract may be sold for use outside the State subject to recall on reasonable notice.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am in complete concurrence with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. Montana's rivers are our State's greatest resource, and dams have been built on the rivers of Montana. The Washington Power & Light Co. has built dams at Noxon Rapids and at Cabinet Gorge, and that power is completely exported from Montana; there is no way to save it for our State.

The only way by which we can preserve for the State of Montana this vital and necessary power is to have enacted into law a measure such as the one my senior colleague has introduced, and thus develop those rivers by means of public power—a Federal power system.

The Knowles Dam bill, which will come before us later today, is a case in point. The Hungry Horse Dam is another case in point. The power we have lost at the Fort Peck Dam is another case in point.

I am in complete accord with this measure, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed as a cosponsor of it.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his kind and cooperative remarks.

Inasmuch as he has mentioned the Cabinet Gorge Dam and the Noxon Rapids Dam, both within the State of Montana, and both generating 200,000 kilowatts of power, I would state that the entire 400,000 kilowatts of power generated at those two dams—built, not by the Montana Power & Light Co., but by the Washington Power & Light Co.—are sent—all of those 400,000 kilowatts of power—outside the State of Montana. So I think it is time that we wake up to the fact that these resources, which are ours, should be used primarily for the benefit of Montana, and only secondarily for the benefit of the States downstream.

SELF-LIQUIDATION OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS THROUGH THE USE OF INCREASED TAX REVENUES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 110(h) of the Housing Act of 1949.

This proposed legislation would provide for self-liquidation of urban renewal projects through the use of increased tax revenues derived from the project area itself. It has been estimated, and realistically so, I believe, that some 75 percent of urban renewal projects which are now receiving Federal financial assistance are designed to create in the project area, new capital values which can then be assessed to provide the city with substantial increases in tax revenues. I feel States should be encouraged to enact State laws allowing the localities to pledge these increased tax revenues as security for the financing with which to pay for the project—these projects could then be made self-liquidating. The tax burden on the Federal taxpayer would be eliminated. It is my understanding California has such a law.

The successful disposal of these self-liquidating revenue bonds to financial institutions would require assurance in advance of the scope and nature of improvements going into the project area. This would mean more and better planning at an early date—in this way soundness of the projects can be better assured.

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

The bill (S. 1947) to amend section 110 (h) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, of projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State law.

This proposed legislation would change the Federal urban renewal statute so that funds would be available for new urban renewal projects only if they are undertaken by cities or other local governments or their agents, purpose being to place urban renewal projects in the future under the effective control of the city or other local government.

Presently, urban renewal projects are for the most part undertaken by housing authorities or urban renewal agencies which have their own separate corporate status or varying degrees of autonomy. It is true members of these separate agencies are generally appointed by the mayor or city fathers, but these urban renewal officials are in office for prescribed terms, and are just not under the effective control of the city or other local governments.

I am of the opinion that officials undertaking the projects should be completely responsible to the city or other local government, and this would be true under this proposed legislation. However, I wish to make it clear that the amendment would not prevent a public corporate body such as a redevelopment agency or a housing authority from undertaking an urban renewal project for the city, if the city actually has full legal and practical control over the operations involved.

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

The bill (S. 1948) to limit financial assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, after July 1, 1965, to projects which cannot be self-liquidating under applicable State law, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HEALTH AND SAFETY RULES FOR CERTAIN METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINES AND QUARRIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries—excluding coal and lignite mines; and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the table until next Monday, August 5, 1963, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring this proposed legislation. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill and an explanatory statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Montana, and the bill

and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1949) to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries—excluding coal and lignite mines; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MOSS) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and enforce a code of reasonable standards, rules, and regulations necessary to the protection of life, health, and safety of employees in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, and to render safe such employment and places of employment and to prevent injury to such employees. Every employer shall furnish and maintain employment and places of employment which shall be reasonably safe for employees in all metallic and nonmetallic mines as defined in this Act, and shall install, furnish, maintain, and use such devices and safeguards, with particular reference to equipment used by and working conditions established by such employers as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, as is required by such a code of reasonable standards, rules, and regulations or by order or otherwise.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, in enforcing and administering the provisions of this Act, is authorized in addition to such other powers and duties as are conferred upon him—

(a) to make studies and investigations with respect to safety provisions and the causes and prevention of injuries in employments covered by this Act and from time to time make to Congress such recommendations as he may deem proper as to the best means of preventing such injuries, and in making such studies and investigations to cooperate with any agency of the United States or with any State agency engaged in similar work;

(b) to utilize the services of any agency of the United States or any State agency engaged in similar work (with the consent of such agency) in connection with the administration of this section;

(c) to promote uniformity in safety standards in employments covered by this Act through cooperative action with any agency of the United States or with any State agency engaged in similar work;

(d) to require the submission by employers covered by this Act of reports of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life and occupational diseases, at such time and in such form as may be prescribed, and to compile, analyze, and publish, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained regarding such accidents and occupational diseases;

(e) to make available for public inspection copies of all findings, recommendations, orders, reports, studies, statistics, and information obtained or issued pursuant to this Act as soon as practicable;

(f) to provide for the establishment and supervision of programs for the education and training of employers and employees in the recognition, avoidance, and prevention of unsafe working conditions in employments covered by this Act, and to consult with and advise employers as to the best means of preventing injuries; and

(g) to hold such hearings, issue such orders, and make such decisions, based upon findings of fact, as are deemed to be necessary to enforce the provisions of this Act, and such orders may require the immediate withdrawal of all persons from an unsafe place except for the purpose of making it safe, and then only after proper precautions have been taken to protect persons while doing such work.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau, may inspect such places of employment, question such employees, and investigate such conditions, practices, or matters in connection with employments subject to this Act, as he may deem appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or any code provision, rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this section. No employer or other person shall refuse to admit the Secretary or his authorized representatives to any such place or shall refuse to permit any such inspection.

(b) Any employer may request the advice of the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines or his authorized representative, in complying with the requirements of any code provision, rule, or regulation adopted to carry out the provisions of this Act. In case of practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships, the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines in his discretion may grant variations from any such code provision, rule, or regulation, or particular provisions thereof, and permit the use of other or different devices if he finds that the purpose of the rule, code provision, or regulation will be observed by the variation and the safety of employees will be equally secured thereby. Any person affected by such code provision, rule, or regulation, or his agent, may request the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines to grant such variation, stating in writing the grounds on which his request is based. Any authorization by the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines of a variation shall be in writing, shall describe the conditions under which the variation shall be permitted, and shall be published as provided in section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended. A properly indexed record of all variations shall be kept in the office of the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines and open to public inspection.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall create and establish an advisory committee composed of not more than six members to exercise consultative functions in connection with the administration of this Act. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry owners and of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry workers in equal number. The members of such committee shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil service and classification laws.

(b) The advisory committee shall advise the United States Bureau of Mines in the promulgation of a code of reasonable standards, and rules and regulations pertaining to safety and health conditions and practices in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries pursuant to this Act.

(c) Each member of the advisory committee shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service on the committee (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses incurred in such service.

SEC. 5. Any employer who, willfully, violates or fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of this Act, or with any lawful rule, regulations, or order adopted to carry out the provisions of this Act, and any employer or other person who willfully interferes with, hinders, or delays the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau in carrying out his duties under this Act by refusing to admit the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau to any place, or to permit the inspection or examination of any employment subject to the provisions of the Act or place of such employment, or who willfully hinders or delays the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau in the performance of his duties in the enforcement of this Act [section], shall be guilty of an offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished for each offense by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $3,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both, and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the officer who willfully permits any such violation to occur, shall be guilty of an offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished also for each offense by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $3,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such officers and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and to prescribe the powers, duties, and responsibilities of such officers and employees.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communications between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, and any other State, territory, possession of the United States, or between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or between points in the same State if passing through any other State or through any territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country.

(b) The term "metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries" includes all types of mine and mining operations, including but not limited to mines, quarries, open pit operations, and strip mines, but not including coal and lignite mines, and all types of operations for the processing of metallic and nonmetallic minerals extracted from such mines. The term "operations for the processing of metallic and nonmetallic minerals" as used in this paragraph means the sizing, shaping, classifying, crushing, grinding, milling, precipitation, separation, concentration, mixing, roasting, pelletizing, smelting, refining, and such other work of processing such metallic and nonmetallic minerals as is usually done by the operator at or in the vicinity of the mine site or at places located in relation to the mine site with regard to the availability of transportation, fuel, power, water, and/or other factors, and does not include such other work of processing such metallic

or nonmetallic minerals as is usually done by a consumer or others in connection with the utilization of such minerals.

(c) The term "operator" means the person, partnership, association, or corporation, [and], or subsidiary of [such] a corporation, operating a mine and owning the right to do so.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

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

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

This bill is based in part on provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, bills introduced in previous Congresses to establish a permanent Federal health and safety program for metallic and nonmetallic mines, and from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Safety Act (Public Law 85-742).

The principal differences in approach between the present draft bill and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act are that the former provides for broad enforcement powers, rather than specifically limited enforcement authority as in the Coal Mine Safety Act, and that it does not exclude smaller mines or have a "grandfather clause" permitting the continued use of unsafe equipment in use at the time of passage of the act.

Principal provisions of the bill would:

1. Direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the U.S. Bureau of Mines, to promulgate and enforce a health and safety code for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries.

2. Grant right of entry for inspection purposes.

3. Require submission of accident and occupational diseases reports as may be prescribed.

4. Empower the Secretary of the Interior to order withdrawal of all persons from an unsafe place except for the purpose of making it safe.

5. Provide criminal penalties for obstruction or failure to comply with orders.

6. Create advisory committee with equal representation of labor and management.

7. Define metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries to include all types of mine and mining operations other than coal and lignite mines, and specified related processing operations, including milling, smelting, and refining and other enumerated operations performed by the mine operator at or adjacent to the mine site or at places located in relation to the mine site with regard to economic factors.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. SIMPSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolutions:

Authority of July 18, 1963:

S.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000: Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SCOTT.

Authorities of July 18 and 24, 1963:

S. 1914. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of July 24, 1963:

S. 1937. A bill to promote equal employment opportunity by securing equal treatment in the various incidents of employment, to establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Administration in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes: Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. MCCARTHY.

Authority of July 25, 1963:

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to authorize appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation: Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John H. Phillips, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Mississippi, for a term of 4 years, a reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, August 5, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 29, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1122) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.

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

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER before the Great Lakes Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 22, 1963.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the extraordinary informative and somber address delivered to the Nation on Friday, July 26, by the President of the United States, on the proposed partial nuclear-test ban treaty.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO NATION ON A-TEST TREATY

Good evening, my fellow citizens.

I speak to you tonight in a spirt of hope. Eighteen years ago the advent of nuclear weapons changed the course of the world as well as the war. Since that time, all mankind has been struggling to escape from the darkening prospects of mass destruction on earth. In an age when both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over, the world of communism and the world of free choice have been caught up in a vicious circle of conflicting ideology and interests. Each increase of tension has produced an increase in arms; each increase in arms has produced an increase in tension.

In these years, the United States and the Soviet Union have frequently communicated suspicions and warnings to each other, but very rarely hope. Our representatives have met at the summit and at the brink; they have met in Washington and in Moscow, at the United Nations and in Geneva. But too often these meetings have produced only darkness, discord or disillusion.

Yesterday a shaft of light cut into the darkness. Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. For the first time, an agreement has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under international control—a goal first sought in 1946 when Bernard Baruch submitted our comprehensive plan to the members of the United Nations.

INSPECTION HURDLE

That plan, and many subsequent disarmament plans, large and small, have all been blocked by those opposed to international inspection. A ban on nuclear tests, however, requires on-the-spot inspection only for underground tests. This Nation now possesses a variety of techniques to detect the nuclear tests of other nations which are conducted in the air or under water. For such tests product unmistakable signs which our modern instruments can pick up.

The treaty initiated yesterday, therefore, is a limited treaty which permits continued underground testing and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police. It requires no control posts, no on-site inspection and no international body.

We should also understand that it has other limits as well. Any nation which signs the treaty will have an opportunity to withdraw if it finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests; and no nation's right to self defense will in any way be impaired. Nor does this treaty mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war.

Nevertheless this limited treaty will radically reduce the nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it will prohibit the United States, the United

Kingdom, the Soviet Union and all others who sign it from engaging in the atmosphere tests which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope.

For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation. While it will not prevent this Nation from testing underground, or from being ready to resume atmospheric tests if the acts of others so require, it gives us a concrete opportunity to extend its coverage to other nations and later to other forms of nuclear tests.

This treaty is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance. We have made clear—most recently in Berlin and in Cuba—our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any threat or aggression. We have also made clear our steadfast determination to limit the arms race. In three administrations, our soldiers and diplomats have worked together to this end, always with the support of Great Britain. Prime Minister Macmillan joined with President Eisenhower in proposing a limited test-ban treaty in 1959, and again with me in 1961 and 1962.

But the achievement of this goal is not a victory for one side—it is a victory for mankind. It reflects no concessions either to or by the Soviet Union. It reflects simply our common recognition of the dangers in further testing.

This treaty is not the millenium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war.

Here is what this step can mean to you and your children and your neighbors.

First, this treaty can be a step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement. The Moscow talks reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter. Under Secretary Harriman made it clear that any nonaggression arrangements across the division in Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests. He also made clear our strong preference for a more comprehensive treaty banning all tests everywhere, and our ultimate hope for general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government, however, is still unwilling to accept the inspections such goals require.

No one can predict with certainty, therefore, what further agreements, if any, can be built on the foundations of this one. They could include controls on preparations for surprise attack, or on numbers and types of armaments. There could be further limitations on the spread of nuclear weapons. The important point is that efforts to seek new agreements will go forward.

NEW CHALLENGES

But the difficulty of predicting the next step is no reason to be reluctant about this one. Nuclear test ban negotiations have long been a symbol of East-West disagreement. If this treaty can also be a symbol—if it can symbolize the end of one era and the beginning of another—if both sides can by this treaty gain confidence and experience in peaceful collaboration—then this short and simple treaty may well become a historic mark in man's age-old pursuit of peace.

Western policies have long been designed to persuade the Soviet Union to renounce aggression, direct or indirect, so that their people and all peoples may live and let live in peace. The unlimited testing of new weapons of war cannot lead toward that end—but this treaty, if it can be followed by further progress, can clearly move in that direction.

I do not say that a world without aggression or threats of war would be an easy world. It will bring new problems, new challenges from the Communists, new dangers of relaxing our vigilance or of mistaking their intent.

But those dangers pale in comparison to those of the spiraling arms race and a collision course toward war. Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. And three times in the last 2½ years I have been required to report to you as President that this Nation and the Soviet Union stood on the verge of direct military confrontation—in Laos, in Berlin, and in Cuba.

A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Krushchev warned the Communist Chinese, "would envy the dead." For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all its horrors.

So let us try to turn the world from war. Let us make the most of this opportunity and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous nuclear arms race, and to check the world's slide toward financial annihilation.

FALLOUT FEARS

Second, this treaty can be a step toward freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout. Our own atmospheric tests last year were conducted under conditions which restricted such fallout to an absolute minimum. But over the years the number and yield of weapons tested have rapidly increased—and so have the radioactive hazards from such testing. Continued unrestricted testing by the nuclear power, joined in time by other nations which may be less adept in limiting pollution, will increasingly contaminate the air that all of us must breathe.

Even then, the number of children and grandchildren with cancer in their bones, with leukemia in their blood or with poison in their lungs might seem statistically small to some, in comparison with natural health hazards. But this is not a natural health hazard—and it is not a statistical issue. The loss of even one human life, or the malformation of even one baby—who may be born long after we are gone—should be of concern to us all. Our children and grandchildren are not merely statistics toward which we can be indifferent.

Nor does this affect the nuclear powers alone. These tests befoul the air of all men and all nations, the committed and the uncommitted alike, without their knowledge and without their consent. That is why the continuation of atmospheric testing causes so many countries to regard all nuclear powers as equally evil; and we can hope that its prevention will enable those countries to see the world more clearly, while enabling all the world to breathe more easily.

Third, this treaty can be a step toward preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them. During the next several years, in addition to the four current nuclear powers, a small but significant number of nations will have the intellectual, physical and financial resources to produce both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In time, it is estimated, many other nations will have either this capacity or other ways of obtaining nuclear warheads, even as missiles can be commercially purchased today.

I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in many hands—in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be increased chances of accidental war, and an increased necessity for the great powers to involve themselves in otherwise local conflicts.

If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian or other city—whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or an enemy, by a large nation or small, from any corner of the world—that one bomb could release more destructive force on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped during the Second World War.

Neither the United States, nor the Soviet Union, nor the United Kingdom, nor France can look forward to that day with equanimity. We have a great obligation—all four nuclear powers have a great obligation—to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess, or produce such weapons.

This treaty can be the opening wedge in that campaign. It provides that none of the parties will assist other nations to test in the forbidden environments. It opens the door for further agreements on the control of nuclear weapons. And it is open for all nations to sign. For it is in the interest of all nations—and already we have heard from a number of countries who wish to join with us promptly.

GAIN IN SECURITY

Fourth, and finally, this treaty can limit the nuclear arms race in ways, which on balance, will strengthen our Nation's security far more than the continuation of unrestricted testing. For in today's world, a nation's security does not always increase as its arms increase, when its adversary is doing the same. And unlimited competition in the testing and development of new types of destructive nuclear weapons will not make the world safer for either side.

Under this limited treaty, on the other hand, the testing of other nations could never be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, all the nuclear strength that we need.

It is true that the Soviets have tested nuclear weapons of a yield higher than that which we have thought to be necessary; but the 100-megaton bomb of which they spoke 2 years ago does not and will not change the balance of strategic power. The United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield; and our security is not, therefore, impaired by the treaty I am discussing.

RISK OF CHEATING

It is also true, as Mr. Khrushchev would agree, that nations cannot afford in these matters to rely simply on the good faith of their adversaries. We have not, therefore, overlooked the risk of secret violations. There is at present a possibility that deep in outer space, that hundreds and thousands and millions of miles away from the earth illegal tests might go undetected. But we already have the capability to construct a system of observation that would make such tests almost impossible to conceal, and we can decide at any time whether such a system is needed in the light of the limited risk to us and the limited reward to others of violations attempted at that range. For any tests which might be conducted so far out in space, which cannot be conducted more easily and efficiently and legally under-

ground, would necessarily be of such a magnitude that they would be extremely difficult to conceal. We can also employ new devices to check on the testing of smaller weapons in the lower atmosphere. Any violation, moreover, involves, along with the risk of detection, the end of the treaty and the worldwide consequence for the violator.

Secret violations are possible and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and, thus, our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must. But it would be a mistake to assume that this treaty will be quickly broken. The gains of illegal testing are obviously slight compared to their cost and the hazard of discovery, and the nations which have initialed and will sign this treaty prefer it, in my judgment, to unrestricted testing as a matter of their own self-interest, for these nations, too, and all nations, have a stake in limiting the arms race, in holding the spread of nuclear weapons and in breathing air that is not radioactive. While it may be theoretically possible to demonstrate the risks inherent in any treaty, and such risks in this treaty are small, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing, the risk of a nuclear arms race, the risk of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war.

NATIONAL DEBATE

This limited test ban, in our most careful judgment, is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race. For all these reasons, I am hopeful that this Nation will promptly approve the limited test-ban treaty. There will, of course, be debate in the country and in the Senate. The Constitution wisely requires the advice and consent of the Senate to all treaties, and that consultation has already begun. All this is as it should be. A document which may mark a historic and constructive opportunity for the world deserves a historic and constructive debate. It is my hope that all of you will take part in that debate, for this treaty is for all of us. It is particularly for our children and our grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington. This debate will involve military, scientific, and political experts, but it must be not left to them alone. The right and the responsibility are yours.

If we are to open new doorways to peace, if we are to seize this rare opportunity for progress, if we are to be as bold and farsighted in our control of weapons as we have been in their inventions, then let us now show all the world on this side of the wall and the other that a strong America also stands for peace. There is no cause for complacency.

We have learned in times past that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed more than once, and we have no illusions now that there are short cuts on the road to peace. At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred.

DANGERS REMAIN

The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict are still there, in Cuba, in southeast Asia, in Berlin, and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster. Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved and that our strength and unity were no longer required.

But now for the first time in many years the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what the future will bring. No one can say whether the time has come for an easing of the struggle. But history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin. According to the ancient Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, get back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Thank you and good night.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are meeting, in informal session, to hear a briefing on the proposed partial test-ban treaty by the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who is accompanied by Mr. William Foster. At the meeting the questions are both searching and blunt, judging from what I can gather; and I am sure everyone would agree that the proposed agreement was openly arrived at and could be considered an open agreement.

In response to questions, the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, stated that there were no gimmicks or side issues attached to the proposal, which shortly will be before the Senate.

In connection with the proposed partial nuclear-test-ban agreement, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement issued by me over the weekend, relative to this most important matter.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The proposed partial test ban agreement represents a breakthrough in the cold war and could, if properly observed by both sides, be the first break in the clouds in many years.

It is a tribute to the persistence, bipartisanship and wisdom, first, of President Eisenhower in 1959 and, then, of President Kennedy and of the many Members of the Senate and Congress as, for example, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] whose resolution in favor of an agreement along the lines which have been reached is cosponsored by 33 other Senators, members of both parties.

These men recognized the need for an end to above-ground tests—on public health grounds, if no other—and refused to be discouraged in spite of many setbacks and disappointments. They thought in farsighted terms and in human terms—of this generation and of children yet to be born—American children, Russian children, indeed, all the world's children.

The agreement would not mean a cutback in defense appropriations but a stabilization rather than an increase of those expenditures.

In a sense it is a gamble, but in view of the critical nature of the problem and the fact that we can continue underground testing, it is in my opinion worth the effort. The escape clause protects us in an honorable manner and safeguards rather than weakens our defense. The fact that our chief negotiator was Averell Harriman who has never been taken in by the Soviet Union, ever since he first served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union two decades ago, is an earnest that our rights have been fully protected. The agreement, in my opinion, serves the interests of our country, our people and our security.

If this agreement is approved it does not mean that there will be total or unilateral disarmament either soon or in the future. What this new agreement will give us is more clean milk and water and food for our children, less strontium to pollute the air, and some basis for hoping that future generations will grow up as normal, healthy human beings.

This agreement will, in my opinion, serve the people's interest, give us some time to face up to other differences, and allow more "breathing" space to the end that a better kind of peace for mankind can be achieved.

It would be wrong to make too much of this agreement. But, even more, it would be wrong to make too little of it. A step, however, small, in the direction of preserving a world fit for human habitation is an immense stride in the history of human civilization.

PASSING OF NORTH DAKOTA REPRESENTATIVE HJALMAR NYGAARD

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 18 North Dakota Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard died of a heart attack in Dr. Calver's office in the Capitol. His untimely passing came as a terrible shock to all of us. He seemed to be in good health and spirits right up to the time of his death.

Hjalmar Nygaard in his 3 short years of service in the Congress established a most commendable record and, along with it, far more than the usual number of friends and admirers.

Hjalmar Nygaard was born and reared on a farm in North Dakota during a period when there were but few years of prosperity. Early in life he came to know what poverty and hardship meant. He worked his way through college, taught in rural schools for a period, and then went into the retailing business, an occupation which he continued until his death.

As a young businessman Hjalmar became interested in community affairs, serving in many important capacities. In recognition of his outstanding community service, he was soon urged by community leaders to be a candidate for the State house of representatives. Here he became one of the truly fine leaders of the North Dakota Legislature, serving both as majority leader and as speaker of the house of representatives. Three years ago he was elected to the U.S. Congress.

In the short period he served here, his many fine qualities were recognized. He quickly established himself as a man of integrity and principle. He was a sincere, humble person who commanded the respect and admiration of all who knew him. He was a good and faithful public servant.

On coming to Congress, Hjalmar was assigned the position he sought on the House Interior Committee where he served with distinction. He did much to further the cause of the Garrison diversion irrigation project in which all of North Dakota is greatly interested. His loss on this committee is an irreplaceable one to the State of North Dakota.

North Dakota has lost one of its finest citizens and, I, one of my best friends.

May I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Tommy, and to all his wonderful family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks several North Dakota newspaper and television editorials in tribute to our departed friend.

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

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, July 21, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE NYGAARD GAINED OFFICE ON BASIS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Unexpected death cut short a career of service Thursday when it claimed North Dakota's Representative Hjalmar C. Nygaard in the Nation's Capitol in Washington.

Because of his high elected office, the Republican Congressman may have been regarded by some as a successful politician. This he was, but he was successful in politics because from the start of his public career he envisioned a public office as one of service to the people, and not as an opportunity to build his own personal fame.

Representative Nygaard has been a teacher, newspaperman, and merchant, but at the same time he has been a mayor, a member of the city council, the school board, the county school officers association, the North Dakota House of Representatives and the U.S. House of Representatives.

During his time in the North Dakota Legislature and in the U.S. Congress, he never operated on the theory that there was a pat solution to everything. He strived for the workable solution, whether it be in the field of education or in getting congressional approval for the Garrison Dam diversion and irrigation project.

He did not win votes because of a great ability to flatter or to stir emotions, but because he was a sincere workman at whatever job he undertook.

It is unfortunate that he was not allowed more time to serve in the public office which he found so interesting. Nevertheless, no one can take away the fact that he did an outstanding job in all the many offices he held.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, July 20, 1963]

NORTH DAKOTA SUFFERS A GREAT LOSS

North Dakota has lost a fine citizen and outstanding public official, and the First District a highly respected Congressman, in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard.

Only a few minutes earlier Congressman Nygaard was on the floor of Congress and it was in the office of the physician to Congress that he died without pain.

In the North Dakota State Legislature Hjalmar Nygaard demonstrated his ability to think clearly and stand firm by his convictions. He earned the respect of both majority and minority members because of his absolute fairness.

It is indeed tragic that a man of only 57 who had earned high office and success should be taken at so early an age. North Dakota needs leadership by men such as this modest, sound-thinking individual, especially when legislation is pending of great importance to North Dakota.

We believe the Governor is justified in calling a special election in the first district to choose a successor. Without reservation we suggest the voters in the eastern half of the State could win distinction by drafting Fred J. Fredrickson, of Valley City, whose close association with the water program over the years qualifies him to render a great service.

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald, July 21, 1963]

Death of U.S. Representative Hjalmar Nygaard in the National Capitol last Thursday was a great loss not alone to his many friends but to this State at large, for in his public life he had won respect and wide acclaim.

His sudden and untimely death at 57 was a shock to the State he had served so well in several capacities, always devoting his full energy to the faithful discharge of the duties entrusted to him.

There are those in public life—all too many, alas—whose first concern is the headlines they will achieve or the public applause they can evoke in the performance of even the routine tasks of public office.

This was never Mr. Nygaard's concern; he was never a headline hunter. To have sought fulsome acclaim for discharging his duties to the best of his ability would have been a compromise with the high standards that had always fixed his course in public life.

Mr. Nygaard was devoted to the principles of the Republican Party, through which he saw the greatest opportunity of service to his State and Nation, but above that he was first a loyal and devoted citizen of his State and country.

North Dakota—and every State and community—can ill afford to lose citizens of Mr. Nygaard's caliber, whether in public or private life. Naming a worthy successor will be no small task.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, July 20, 1963]

HJALMAR NYGAARD, GOOD CITIZEN

Hjalmar Nygaard epitomized, to a large degree, the typical citizen who rises to a position of political leadership.

He was a farm boy who worked his way in college to a teaching certificate, then taught in rural schools for several years, including in Emmons County.

From school teaching, he went into the small town grocery business and eventually into hardware retailing, an occupation which he was to continue through his business life.

And in the small town he interested himself in public affairs, serving on the school board and as mayor of his town.

To this point, he was as one with thousands of other North Dakota people.

Eventually, through no effort of his own—he actually resisted the idea—Hjalmar Nygaard was nominated for the State House of Representatives, serving his first session there in 1949. Quite naturally, educational matters were his major interest.

To begin with, Hjalmar Nygaard cut no wide swath in the legislature. He minded his business and worked hard, but he had a knack for getting along with other legislators both of his party and of the opposition. So before long he was looked to for leadership, and he became first a floor leader and then the presiding officer, the house speaker. And, when in 1960 Republicans were sorting through potential candidates for Congress, it was natural again that Nygaard should be a top choice. He was nominated, won that year and again in 1962, so that upon hs death Thursday he was serving his second term in the U.S. Congress.

In Congress, Nygaard followed the course he followed in the State legislature. He made few speeches and sought no headlines, but buckled down to serious work in committee and cloakroom, where personal influence is most effective. His absence will hurt during coming months when North Dakota's Garrison diversion project comes before House committees, where his shepherding would have been important to success.

Politically, Hjalmar Nygaard was a moderate. He had strong convictions, but he tolerated opposing convictions. He was a conservative, but not a reactionary conservative.

Personally, he was a friendly, outgoing man, honest and sincere, easy to know and just as easy to like. He was, more than most political figures, just like the neighbor across the street or next door. As we said at the beginning, more than most he typified the average North Dakota citizen.

These were the attributes that made him successful in politics and which probably would have raised him to a position of high respect and influence in Congress. They're the attributes of a man even his political foes could trust, respect and like.

His death Thursday is a sore loss to the State he represented.

[From the Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, July 20, 1963]

(By Bill Wright)

Hjalmar Nygaard was a gentleman, and we mourn his death.

The Enderlin hardware merchant, only in November elected to his second term in the House of Representatives, showed fine prospects of becoming one of the State's most accomplished men to have ever served in that body.

It was the consensus of those who watched him in Washington that here was a man who would distinguish not only himself, but the people and the State he represented.

Hjalmar Nygaard was a humble man—plain, friendly, honest, decent; never haughty, never cruel, never cold.

He had a quiet manner among his constituents, a way of reassuring them merely by his presence and by his calm Scandinavian philosophy and accent.

He knew his faults, admitted them publicly. We've heard him say many times, "There's not much I can do as a freshman Congressman." But as a second-termer Hjalmar Nygaard was beginning to move in a circle of effectiveness that is impossible for a freshman Member.

His greatest achievements, legislatively, were ahead of him when he suddenly died. It is a frailty of Congress that ability is almost always ranked second to seniority. Yet, when the two qualities are present, as they were in Mr. Nygaard, the effectiveness of the Member is boundless.

We feel something of a personal loss, because the Congressman was a good friend. We worked with him on some matters, campaigned with him, and was the recipient of his kindly counsel.

We drove miles across North Dakota's highways, while Congressman Nygaard and Senator YOUNG talked of many things, mostly politics.

Once at a hotel in Fargo, the room clerk put us into his and Mrs. Nygaard's room by mistake.

The Congressman, arriving from Washington late at night, tired and under strain of a busy schedule that would start early in the morning, merely laughed as the two of us struggled with the transfer of luggage, and all the accoutrements of a campaign, from one room to another.

Mr. Nygaard was never cross, never excited.

His administrative assistant, Mrs. Irene Edwards, was the longtime "Girl Friday" of the late Senator Bill Langer.

The Senator, she told us, often fired her at the drop of a hat, then rehired her before she could get to her desk.

She marveled at Congressman Nygaard's composure, his restraint, his tolerance and expressed amazement at the contrast between her two bosses.

She will be a very sad woman at the death of this boss, as she was when Senator Langer died.

She is not alone in her grief.

This was a very good man.

NORTH DAKOTA BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
July 19, 1963.

(By Fred Froeschle)

All North Dakota has been saddened by the death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard.

The State will miss his broad experience in government and the fine associations he had developed during his relatively brief time in Congress.

One of his unique qualities was his ability to inspire the friendship and confidence of diverse political associates. This was in part due to his dedication to the welfare of North Dakota and the Nation and also in part to the courtesy he accorded to his political adversaries, as well as to his friends and associates.

In the North Dakota Legislature he displayed his capacity as a student of legislation, and this was a special quality which offered promise of a successful career in Congress.

His service to the State included offices at almost every level of government. He was more a public servant than a politician, and this perhaps led to his success in politics.

The management of this station joins all North Dakotans in mourning the death of a great citizen and an outstanding public servant.

[From the Ransom County Gazette, July 25, 1963]

NO EXCUSES NEEDED FOR NYGAARD TRIBUTE

If the death of U.S. Representative Hjalmer Nygaard was a blow to North Dakota, one can readily imagine what a loss it was to residents of Ransom County.

Representative Nygaard embodied things governmental as we know them today, many of which are representative only of our era and which will never be repeated. He was a conservative, not as we think of conservatism on the BARRY GOLDWATER level, but one who could forgo hardline conservatism if he thought it was for the good of all. He represented North Dakota first and foremost in an effort to fulfill the duties of a station given to him by the people.

His rise to political stature is indicative of the struggle of a populace to have its capable men represent them in Government. His candidacy for the first time was encouraged by those who recognized his ability more than he did.

In the wake of Hjalmer's untimely passing, this excerpt from a publication of the U.S. Press Association "The Right To Mourn" seems particularly appropriate:

In these days of timesaving devices when we are inclined to streamline the flow of life and worship at the shrine of efficiency, the experience of giving final tribute to a great man should give us pause for consideration. In so doing, we consider that only the inspiring grandeur of a funeral procession fulfills the yearning of the living to express their love of the departed.

"Recently we have experienced a wave of materialistic rationalizing designed to convince us that the burial of the dead is merely a disposal problem that should be simplified and conducted along economic and sanitary lines. Such advocates forget, or are insensible of the fact that the removal of ceremony also removes dignity, respect, sentiment—and the right to mourn."

The death of an honored man among North Dakotans and the beauty and splendor of his interment should serve to remind us that the living should not only keep but should treasure the rituals of bereavement and respect. If there are those whose passing deserves particular attention, certainly the man from Enderlin who has done his best to serve North Dakotans is among them.

[From the New Rockford Transcript, July 25, 1963]

DEDICATED SERVANT

If you could be sure of anything it would have been that Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard never thought he would one day serve his State in Washington. He was a humble man. This was the foremost of his many fine qualities—qualities many people never knew he possessed simply because of his quiet, unpretentious way of doing things.

While serving in the State legislature he gained the confidence and respect of his colleagues; he served them, not himself. As his circle of friends grew, more and more people recognized that this quiet, small-town businessman was the type that could be depended upon to follow the dictates of his conscience and to act unselfishly while in public office.

His philosophy of government was ingrained in him by his parents whose firm belief in free enterprise and democracy never wavered. Neither did his. He had confidence in people, not in government, and he wanted to continue this great, free land for posterity.

When Hjalmar died so unexpectedly at the age of 57 last week, North Dakota lost a dedicated public servant. He was the rare type individual that never played politics simply for politic's sake. He wasn't a fence-straddler and never hesitated to make his position known. There are too few diplomats in public office today and our State suffered a setback with his untimely demise.

North Dakotans will remember Hjalmar Nygaard because he was their type of person—honest, sound, conscientious and sincere. He was a dedicated public servant with a world of admirers.

[From the Bottineau Courant, July 24, 1963]

The sudden death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard was a shock to everyone in our State. Although Mr. Nygaard had not served in office very many years, he had won the admiration and support of most people in our State. He was highly recognized in national circles and his office was recognized as being capably and efficiently managed. Mr. Nygaard was for North Dakota, and while his politics may have differed from others, he had the interest of the people of our State at heart at all times.

We had met Mr. Nygaard several times and our regard for him was the highest. We felt he was a personal friend. His loss to our State will be great. His death at his young age is a great loss.

[From the McLean County Independent, July 25, 1963]

A GRAVE LOSS

All of North Dakota suffered a grave loss last week with the swift and unexpected death of Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard. Few have served North Dakota so well in such a relatively short period of time.

Although a representative of eastern North Dakota, following his reelection last November, Hjalmar nonetheless ably served all of North Dakota.

Quiet and unassuming, he disproved the statement that "good guys always come in second." Hjalmar was, in every respect, a good man, a man who was fair in his political deliberations, who sought full knowledge where diverse opinions were expressed, who moved about without fanfare as he effectively pursued the goals in which he sincerely believed.

Only in his sophomore term as a Congressman, Hjalmar had a bright future in Washington. His seat on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, where reauthorization of Garrison Diversion will be considered first, was and is needed by North Dakota.

It was as a member of the State legislature that Hjalmer was best known to most North Dakotans. He was no overpowering figure in the House where he served as majority leader and speaker in later sessions * * * and many were somewhat surprised when the Republicans tabbed him for the nomination as a Congressman at their 1960 convention.

Like other members who had served their legislative district and their State well in Bismarck, Hjalmar was relatively unknown outside of his home area, away from the legislative halls in 1960. But through his six terms in the statehouse, he had demonstrated to his party associates and even to those of the opposition that he carried within that distinguished stature honesty, fairness, diligence to duty.

Death is always tragic * * *. It is especially tragic when it strikes a man in the "bloom" of his life.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota in the remarks that he has made about our late colleague Representative Nygaard of North Dakota. As a neighbor, we, too, feel his loss. I wish to take this opportunity to express to his family our deep sorrow, and extend our deep condolences and sympathy in his passing.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate those comments very much.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL of California, is to be commended for his courage in dealing with the far-rightest movement in the United States.

Some of these extremists have attempted to infiltrate and take control of many fine organizations in the United States, including the Young Republican organization.

I am very proud of the position taken by the president of the Young Republican Federation in North Dakota, Allan C. Young. He is one of the most able and sound conservative thinking young men in our State. Allan is no relative of mine, but I would be happy if he were.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter under date of July 6, 1963, from Allan C. Young to my good friend, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL.

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

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK.,
July 6, 1963.

Senator KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just returned to North Dakota after attending our National

Young Republican Convention in San Francisco. While I enjoyed your State and the wonderful welcome I received, there is a matter so shocking that I felt this letter necessary.

The display by the California Young Republicans at that convention was more akin to a nightmare than the responsibility which was expected. These people, led by Robert Gaston, were almost unbelievable. I naturally have read in the press and elsewhere about the activities of the extreme right. However, I must admit that I didn't fully accept what I read, but I do now.

After several conversations with California Young Republicans, I couldn't believe that they were attacking not only yourself but were telling me what they were going to do after they had gotten rid of the Republican Senator from California. In North Dakota there are certain Young Republicans who are not in favor of our senior Senator, MILTON YOUNG, but happily their number is small. The attacks and charges made against you were the worst kind of political back stabbing and hate mongering. Of all of this, I am sure you are aware, yet I feel that I should let you know that not all Young Republicans are of an irresponsible nature and that if the great bulk of Young Republicans were given proper leadership, this current wild-eyed bunch of extreme conservatives would fade quickly from young Republican organizations.

Perhaps a word from a Young Republican in North Dakota cannot contribute a great deal to ease the pressure from other young people in California. Nonetheless, this letter does allow me to take a burden off my mind and to continue strengthening the Young Republicans of North Dakota to the end of electing Republicans and not the confused course which I witnessed in California.

Senator, my best wishes go out to you and I encourage you in your fight to maintain a responsible, honest and Republican position.

Again with best wishes.

Yours,

ALLAN C. YOUNG.

PAPER CRANES IN SUPPORT OF TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the San Francisco Women for Peace sent letters to all Members of the U.S. Senate urging support of the test ban negotiations. Accompanying each letter was a folded paper crane. The significance of the crane and the story of the activity of the San Francisco women is told in the following news release.

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

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

PAPER CRANES FLY FOR A TEST BAN

Many Women for Peace and their children will mail 1,000 paper cranes to the negotiators of the United States, U.S.S.R., and England, meeting in Moscow. They will be mailed at the post office at Haight and Clayton Streets at 1:30 p.m. on July 15, sent to urge that a comprehensive test ban agreement be reached now. We have met in the Haight-Ashbury district in San Francisco to make these 1,000 paper cranes during the past weeks to express our wish for life.

There is an ancient legend in Japan that a crane lives 1,000 years. Following the bombing of Hiroshima in 1945, the children who had been hospitalized from radiation effects developed a story of their own drawn from that legend—that if a child could make 1,000 paper cranes, he would be granted his wish to live.

The children called themselves "The Club of the Paper Cranes." In 1954, 9 years after the bomb, a little girl named Sadako contracted leukemia as a result of radiation exposure she had suffered as an infant. She was put with the other children into one of the A-bomb hospitals, and she too joined the children in their terrible quest for hope. On the day that Sadako made her 964th paper crane, she died. And at her funeral the children placed with her 1,000 paper cranes. Sadako has become a symbol of the children's movement; the paper cranes have become a symbol of peace, of the hope that there will be no more Hiroshimas.

We send a paper crane to our Nation's Senators asking that they actively support such a test ban treaty as a first step toward general and complete disarmament under effective international controls.

On this day balloons, sent aloft by our children, will carry brightly colored paper cranes on their way and with them our children's trust in the future.

We ask all who cherish life to act now to express their desire to preserve it.

Mr. METCALF. In addition to its significance in connection with the test ban, the story has an interesting sidelight. Under the present law such a demonstration as children launching balloons could not take place here. Unless Congress acts on H.R. 7643 and S. 1897, such an innocent and colorful demonstration can never take place in Washington, D.C.

THE TFX CONTRACT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I spent a very interesting weekend studying the carefully censored transcript of testimony before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] which is investigating the TFX contract. I do not hesitate to say that I was jolted by what I read.

In reviewing the July 25 comments of my colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and in studying testimony by Navy Secretary Korth before the committee, I was shocked to see spelled out publicly the obvious business and political cross currents which figured in Secretary Korth's judgments on the aircraft contract.

There is, in my mind, a parallel that cries for discussion. If my recollection of the Dixon-Yates case is correct, the courts determined there should be great concern for Government officials entering into relationships which are fraught with temptation. To use the court's words, "The statute"—meaning the conflict-of-interest statute—"is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened." One of the basic considerations in drafting the conflict-of-interest statute was the effect it could have on preventing honest Government agents from succumbing to temptation. Every attempt was made to prevent officials from entering into relationships which—to again use the words of the statute—are "fraught with temptation."

It is patently obvious in studying even the well sanitized transcripts from the July 23 hearings that the factors in the TFX contract were extremely "temptation fraught."

The Secretary, by his own admission, is a man of integrity. He knows that his judgments as the Navy's civilian in the Pentagon can have a profound effect on the future of our great Nation. He should have avoided the temptations, for by anyone's standards, they were monumental. He was president of the Texas bank which loaned something under $600,000 to the financially distressed General Dynamics Corp.; he was also a substantial stockholder in that bank. It was axiomatic that much of the moneys lent by Korth would be spent in Korth's State, if General Dynamics got the TFX contract. It was equally obvious that a nod toward General Dynamics would cause much good to accrue to the New Frontier, and the whole transaction would greatly enhance the Fred Korth image in the banking circles he hopes to rejoin when he disentangles himself from the Kennedys.

Mr. President, if I were to define temptation, I could find no more graphic example than Secretary Korth's TFX dilemma. Seldom has one man allowed himself to be pressured so much by so many while claiming to maintain superbly balanced judgment. I would venture the guess that the conflict-of-interest statute was authored with "temptation fraught" situations such as this in mind.

Let us take a closer and more analytical look at the time when Korth—with Zuckert and McNamara—overruled the combined judgment of evaluation teams and military greats, the caliber of General LeMay and Admirals Burke and Anderson—the latter since cashiered out of the Pentagon. Did Korth reveal to his confederates his staggering conflict of interest? If he did not, he should have. If he did, then McNamara and Zuckert are equally culpable. These Secretaries owe the public answers to many questions stemming from this judgment. In what camouflaged vacuum, in what logic-tight compartment, were these decisions rendered that fly in the face of fact?

From my seat on the Senate floor, Mr. President, it becomes patent that the cost factors, the performance factors, the other military, economic, and national security considerations which would be expected to determine the largest single contract ever entered into by any government in the history of the world—it may reach $12 billion—were not of primary importance to this administration.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. It became obvious many months ago, that TFX and the administration's standards of what might be called "TFX ethics" are shot through with political interest and favoritism. There are facts pointing to a misuse by

some of the trusts and responsibilities which repose in public office.

The July 23 testimony of Secretary Korth is shocking almost beyond belief. The implications and the connotations in his revelations are even more surprising.

I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that the TFX hearings should be continued until all parties involved have made full disclosures of the motives for their judgments in this gigantic contract.

GOLDWATER ON EXTREMISTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent article in a recent issue of Newsweek by Raymond Moley entitled "Goldwater on Extremists."

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

GOLDWATER ON EXTREMISTS

(By Raymond Moley)

Governor Rockefeller's attack upon extremists was immediately interpreted in some sections of the press as a pointed criticism of Senator GOLDWATER. The Governor later, in response to press questioning, said that "while I have great respect for Barry's patriotism, his dedication to political life. * * * I have some concern whether * * * he may not end up as a captive of those elements." This raises certain questions which I shall attempt to answer in this and a subsequent article. The first is what has been GOLDWATER's attitude toward extremists and extremism? Another, considering the fact that the Rockefeller statement made a great deal of the racial issue, what has been GOLDWATER's record on the racial issue?

The Governor is somewhat late in bringing up the question of extremism. In August 1959 in a piece entitled "All-or-nothing?" I referred to people who "in the past or recently have expressed, either in print or personally, unhappiness concerning political leaders whose views and votes have not completely and specifically met their own convictions. The vice of such irreconcilability is that it defeats the very objectives which most conservatives are earnestly seeking. This habit, it seems to me, is much more a threat to sound government than all the power and prattle of radicals. The all-or-nothing attitude means a house divided, which cannot stand."

THE SENATOR AGREES

Almost immediately after this appeared in print, I had a totally unsolicited letter from GOLDWATER which expressed thorough agreement with my statement.

Ten months later I returned to the subject in a piece entitled "The Irreconcilables," in which I wrote: "GOLDWATER is not irreconcilable. He realizes that to throw into sharp reverse the trend of the past 25 years would be inexpedient and self-defeating. What is needed is to slow up the drift to the left before it is too late."

Again I had a letter of commendation and agreement from GOLDWATER:

"Your column is good and I hope we can get the conservatives to take up this line. To put it in a very simple way, the Democrats have their political liabilities, but they say they are Democrats and they vote for Democrats in the hope that they can change them, but with a Republican the answer has been, 'We just don't vote for him—that will teach him a lesson.'"

Essentially, GOLDWATER believes in attaining reasonably conservative ends through supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates. His moving speech at the Republican convention seconding the nomination of Richard Nixon urged his followers, who were crying out for his nomination, instead to get into the Republican ranks and work and support the ticket. In the campaign which followed, GOLDWATER made innumerable speeches supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates.

RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

In 1962 he was asked whether, if he were a voter in New York, he would support Senator JAVITS. He said he would, and as chairman of the senatorial campaign committee he actually raised funds for JAVITS, as he did for all other Republican candidates for the Senate.

In the Rockefeller statement a considerable space is given to the racial issue. For several years after 1946, GOLDWATER was a member of the NAACP. He was and is a member of the Urban League. As a powerful officer in the Arizona Air National Guard he brought about its integration. When he went to high school in Phoenix the school was integrated. Later it was segregated. But when he was a member of the NAACP after the war he helped to bring about the reintegration of the school and gave money to fight the case in the courts.

Thus the implications in Rockefeller's language are not only unfair to the Arizona Senator himself, but a grave reflection upon all those who want to support GOLDWATER for President. Nobody who has any sense can believe that this man, who has stood so firmly in the minority for conservative principles for so many years, could be a "prisoner" of anybody or anything except his convictions.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S SPEECH BEFORE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very fine speech delivered by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] before the Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco, Calif., on June 27, 1963.

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

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 27, 1963

In the last 4 or 5 years, I have spoken in many places. But never have I felt more at home than I do with the young Republicans. In this group here today I firmly believe there is more potential leadership than you could find in any group of similar size anywhere in this country.

Some people have been surprised at the large number of young people who are coming into the Republican Party: people like yourselves—able, energetic, and intelligent leaders of the new generation. And this movement has been a source of great concern to the liberals.

At first, they began writing articles to show it wasn't really happening. Then they began to concede that maybe just a little handful of students might have become interested. Then they began to show panic. Well, I have been back and forth across this country in hundreds of meetings and I am here to say that there really is a profoundly important move taking place especially among the more able young people. The liberals have good reason for their panic.

I well remember a meeting not long ago in a Middle Western State. There are several very large universities in that State each with more than 25,000 students. The Conservative Club at one of these universities had invited me to speak on campus. The school I'm referring to is well known for its very liberal atmosphere. Out of more than 1,000 faculty members, I would be surprised if you could find more than six who would confess to being Republicans among the faculty. Only two faculty members would even let their names be associated with anything named the Conservative Club.

But how about the students?

It turned out that they were far more openminded than their faculty. You know it was the faculty, not the students, who were slaves to political conformity. This Conservative Club contracted for the largest auditorium on the campus, and that night the auditorium was completely filled, with an overflow crowd outside. Not filled with faculty members. Few of them were there. It was students. And their questions were keen—not hostile—but keen and searching. They were looking for answers. It was a wonderful and refreshing experience.

Again and again I have found this to be true. And it is not so much the quantity of young people who are coming into the Republican Party that impresses me most. No. It is the quality of the young people who are coming in which is the great thing. We are getting the best. It is the high leadership potential among the young Republicans which is the great, heartening thing for the future. I know that right here among you today there are probably six future U.S. Senators. There are as many Governors. There are here in this room today a score of future Congressmen. There are many of you here in this room today who will hold important and responsible local offices.

I don't say this to make you happy. If all of you were fully aware of what happens to a man when he runs for office, you would not be entirely happy at the prospect. Or if you knew some of the trying and exasperating experiences you can have once you have been elected to office, you would not talk of officeholding as a totally happy experience.

But there is something about discharging your duty as a public officer which is very bracing. It is a deeply satisfying endeavor. And if you have strong beliefs about the nature of man and the meaning of government, you can't stay out of this fight. It isn't easy to confine yourself just to making a living, raising a family, and going fishing on weekends if the very basis of life, as you understand it, is in critical danger.

No, the young people of this country are realizing that there is something profoundly wrong with the way things are going. Of course, there are some people who are so lacking in vision or imagination that they cannot see or comprehend an attack unless war has actually been declared, and armed forces are on the move. It takes some imagination to see that the greatest victories are won sometimes without a shot being fired. Yes, and the great defeats we have suffered have not been through a declared war, but at a time when we were supposed to be at peace. The great country of China was lost to us not when we were technically at war, but when we were thought to be at peace. It was not a military failure, but a failure of our political leadership.

And now, most recently, our enemy, the Soviet Union, has secured a military base only 90 miles from our shore. No shot was fired by American forces. In fact, our Armed Forces were instructed by their Commander in Chief not to fire a shot. I will say to you that the loss of Cuba was, in all probability, a greater and more dangerous defeat than any we have suffered in any war. No one

can fathom the depth of the danger presented to us by the Soviet military occupation of the nearby island of Cuba. And this defeat was caused, I say to you, by the failure of our national political leadership to understand and deal firmly with the Soviet threat. We have suffered defeat after defeat like these. These have been failures of political vision and political imagination. And why, I ask you, does a leadership, which calls itself liberal, always underrate any threat which comes from the left?

I ask you here tonight—how many more defeats can we take? How much longer dare we keep a weak and indecisive national leadership?

At this juncture in history, the risks of politics have clearly become too great for us to leave in the hands of ambitious opportunists. Our political leaders must stand for something. There must be the kind of firmness and clarity in the judgment of our political leadership that comes only from strong political principles. Vacillation in leadership is inevitable if there is no firm belief in the basic principles, and no clear understanding of the nature of our enemy.

If you ask the liberal Democrats what they stand for, they will list for you a multitude of programs.

Now, program is no substitute for principle.

A lot of talk about a school lunch program, for example, will not serve to distract us from the basic fact that an atheistic society is confronting us and has an unyielding determination to destroy us.

I firmly believe it is this very vacuum of principle which young and idealistic people sense in today's liberals. It is, in part, the fundamental moral and intellectual bankruptcy of modern-day liberalism that is causing young people to turn increasingly to the Republican Party.

All of us know there are defects in our society which we all wish were not there—defects we all wish could be corrected. Young people especially are very sensitive to the fact that even in our own country, wealthy beyond any society known in history, pockets of poverty remain. And we all know of other imperfections in our country.

Well, these liberal reformers long ago set about correcting all of the evils that man is heir to. It meant a tremendous program of social engineering. In fact, it meant a whole series of programs. It meant programs within programs. It got so that no one was politically respectable unless he had not one, but a whole set of programs. For more than 30 years there has been a tremendous bustle across the Nation as the modern liberal politicians have gone about their multitude of programs, most of which had to do with taking from one group and giving to another. It was all very forward looking. More than anything else, it looked forward to getting more votes for liberal politicians.

Now, during these past 30 years a vast number of programs—a few large ones, many small ones—have been carried through to completion. Some of them have been enacted into law. A few of these programs have actually led to some noticeable improvement in social conditions. About all we can say for some others—like the farm program—is that we have been able to survive them.

It really is a great tribute to the underlying productivity of this country that we have not been bankrupted by some of these hair-brained schemes. It says a great deal for the stamina and the productive forces in this country that they have not only been able to overcome the severe handicaps imposed upon them by the modern liberal reformers, but they have gone through and over these barriers to achieve a level of productivity unimagined only a generation ago.

Can you imagine what level—what economic peak—we should have reached by now if we had not been carrying the tremendous and steadily increasing burdens of the last 30 years?

Can you imagine the rocketing effect on the economy, the vast increase in employment, if some of the tax brakes had been taken off and the basic productive forces really let loose? A burst of energy would have been released in this country to bring about economic benefits so great that they would have transcended even the utopian dreams of the liberal reformers.

Now, this is no dream. We have seen what this country can do under a heavy burden of liberal handicaps. The lack of vision on the part of the liberal reformers has not been completely fatal. But it has held us back.

Let me say, it is not just that the liberals' understanding of the economy has been defective. After all, economic matters constitute only one aspect of our civilization. Important as economics may be, there are other aspects—moral and cultural—of much greater importance for all of us. Defects in economic thinking could be tolerated, as long as they were not completely and overwhelmingly disastrous, provided other more important aspects of our civilization were well understood, and kept in a same perspective. But it is exactly here that the narrowness of the modern liberal vision has been most strikingly apparent.

Yes, the narrowness of the modern liberal view has been that all problems are seen as essentially economic in character. This is the Marxist view, and it has had a deep effect on the modern liberals in this country.

This same narrow perspective has caused the modern liberals to view the profoundly complex problems of foreign policy as basically economic, and capable of simple economic solutions. For years we have measured the strength of our ties with other countries by the amount of economic aid we were giving them.

Now, what could be more narrow or more unreal than the idea that our good friends are the ones we give the most money to?

What could be more foolish than the belief that our good friends will become enemies if we stop paying them?

Only men with the narrowest economic vision could believe that money will buy friendship. Yet, the policy of the liberal politicians shows that this strange, unreal and dangerous myth is actually their basic belief. I say we do not dare to continue on such an unreal basis.

Or, turning to the domestic scene, what could be more ludicrous than the idea that the problem of the quality of education in this country can be solved merely by appropriating very large sums, so we can build bigger and more elaborate facilities?

The naive and narrow idea that spending our resources in larger quantities will somehow solve every dangerous and complex problem of foreign and domestic policy is the characteristic—and fatal—weakness of the liberals. They are obsessed with economic solutions for every problem. This makes them incapable of seeing our problems in their full complexity. Obsession with economics makes them blind to the deeper motives of men and at the same time incapable of any sound and realistic assessment of our national problems.

Some 30 years ago, the liberals began the propagation of the myth that it was the economic solutions that were basic and total. The "standard of living," for example, came to be the measure of our civilization. And "standard of living" came to mean only economic well-being. Almost everyone was taught to forget that a truly human standard of living involves many aspects of life which are not economic, and which cannot be understood through economic measurement.

Yet, as we look back on the depression of the thirties, we find that one of the most evil aftereffects of that depression was the widespread belief which had been drilled into our people by the reformers, that a rising economic standard of living was the sole and total solution to our problems.

Now I would by no means suggest that a rising economic standard of living is unimportant. It is very important. But I would say that the most important elements of life are beyond economics. It is the modern liberal blindness to these other far more important areas which constitutes their essential danger. And this blindness can lead to social evils of the very greatest consequence.

A view of life which sees all problems in terms of economic solutions is, I say, a false view, and such a view leads inevitably, inescapably to false solutions. And I say to you that the application of false solutions to important and dangerous problems make those problems actually worse, more dangerous, more threatening. We cannot afford to leave the destiny of our great Nation in the hands of men who actually believe that spending money is the basic solution to all problems.

But it is not alone the crude narrowness of vision on the part of the modern liberals which makes them both dangerous and unworthy as leaders of the American nation.

Perhaps the most disturbing and dangerous fact about these modern liberals is that they are not really liberals at all, by any standards. They have betrayed the very standards they profess. They use the standard of liberalism to deceive people of good will into believing that the idealism of the liberals of 50 years ago—the inspired reformers, for example, who won the vote for women—is the same as these modern liberals.

Now, years ago there were evils in this country which demanded some attention. There are defects in our society today which we dare not ignore. And liberals of 50 years ago fought some of those evils with sacrifice and an admirable sense of dedication.

But where are those self-sacrificing and dedicated liberals today?

Do you find them wintering in the great mansions of Palm Beach? Do you find them summering in the great mansions of Hyannis Port?

Mind you, I don't believe that the possession of a great family fortune necessarily precludes the possibility of idealism. It just makes it a little harder to come by.

Fifty years ago, there were some liberals in this country—liberals like Lincoln Steffens, who led a campaign to clean up the moral and political corruption of our big cities. They led a fight to destroy the corrupt city political machines which lived off graft and hidden connections with vice and crime. These men were genuine liberals. They really believed in what they were doing. They led a genuine fight to break the power of these corrupt, big-city political machines whose power had become so great they could dominate whole State and National party organizations.

The evil growth of these sinister big-city machines was like a cancer inside the body politic. It was well known that their tentacles reached deep into the offices of the Governors of great States, and even into the Halls of Congress. The White House itself was not immune to these influences.

Now, I ask you to look at the situation today.

You who are here from New York City, do you really believe that the Tammany machine is broken? Do you believe that government in your city is free from the graft and corruption so characteristic of big-city machines?

I seem to recall some investigations during the last several years that seem to suggest that business is going on very much as usual in New York City. In fact, only several days ago the press reported that an emissary from very high places made a special trip

to visit with Carmine de Sapio. You know who it was—it was one of the relatives.

And you who are here from Pennsylvania. What about the Green machine in Philadelphia? Has there ever been a tougher, more tightly controlled political machine in the history of Philadelphia? Has there ever been a political machine in your city more capable of delivering a machine vote—for a price?

And what about you people here from Illinois? Let me ask you about politics in Cook County.

What about the ruthless Cook County machine in Chicago? Is it any different from the Kelly-Nash machine of which it is the heir? Is this bastion of modern liberal strength any less corrupt than it ever was?

I ask you, is it just coincidence that the political power of the infamous Cook County machine in Chicago is based especially on just those precincts which are the most vice-ridden—on those wards which have the highest crime rate?

I ask you, is it just a coincidence that this evil and corrupt political power is generated in just the most crime-infested areas of Chicago?

If we want to know what this kind of political power means, let us remember the police scandals in Chicago during recent years. And by all means, let's not forget the vote frauds of 1960.

Now, it is sometimes charged that corrupt big-city politicians of the North who constitute the chief base of modern liberal political strength also pay off political favors to criminal elements in the big cities, through a selective enforcement of the law. Some people whose politics are not considered "right" find the laws are enforced against them with the greatest severity. Others, whose politics are helpful to the ruling machine, can operate "wide open" without regard for the law.

In Chicago, they went a step further. Everyone knows that some of the city police under the rule of the corrupt Cook County machine became themselves so corrupt they went into actual competition with the criminals.

Now, the corruption of the political machines in the big cities of the North is well known. It is no secret. It is one of the great scandals of American politics. It is one of the worst evils on the American scene.

But have you heard any of the so-called liberals in the national administration condemning this wholesale corruption? No, you have not. And why do they keep silent?

Fifty years ago, American liberals were fierce in their attacks on these evil big-city machines with their deadly and growing influence which had spread through the whole American political system from the municipalities right up through Congress itself, and even into the White House.

What about today?

No one can deny that the northern big-city machines are more powerful than ever. No one can deny that their evil influence is greater than ever before in history.

Where are the self-styled liberals of today?

How do we account for the deafening silence among the modern liberals with regard to this paramount national evil, this national disgrace?

How is it that this evil which 50 years ago inspired a flood of liberal pamphlets and books, which led to national crusades and fervent speeches across the land—how is it that this evil, now far worse, far more pervasive, far more influential than ever before—is greeted by absolute silence on the part of the modern liberals?

The cause of this silence is clear and unmistakable.

I charge that there is today a cynical alliance between the politicians who call themselves liberal and the corrupt big-city machines whose job it is to deliver the bloc votes of the big northern cities. It is the corrupt big-city machines which elect these men to public office.

I charge that the politicians who have inherited the tradition of liberalism in this country today are not liberals at all, but merely ambitious men who have become the captives of the big-city machines. These ambitious men know that the tradition of liberalism in this country demands that they carry on an appearance of righteous crusades, but as capives of the big-city machines of the North, they can now carry on only those few token crusades that actually tend to strengthen the big-city machines. It is a fact that they dare not attack in any way the evil forces that generate the power of these city machines of the North—least of all the profound and spreading evil of the corrupt machine itself.

I charge the liberal politicians of this country with moral bankruptcy.

Narrow as the liberal vision may be, obsessed as it now is with economic solutions to all problems, there once were some noble elements in liberalism before the modern liberals became the captives of the big-city machines.

But now they are not even liberals.

They are only allowed an occasional sham crusade which will support the political needs of the big-city machines, whose captives they are.

They have now become the phony liberals.

And just because they are phony liberals they have become extremely dangerous. Conscious of the very questionable claim they have to the title of liberal, they are tempted into bringing into a fierce heat those few problem areas where their political owners allow them, from time to time, to make a liberal show.

Yes, in those last remaining few areas where they have not sold out completely, they find it necessary to create a tremendous furor so their absence in the really critical liberal areas will not be so noticeable.

Perhaps the saddest thing about American politics is this liberal bankruptcy. In spite of other very severe shortcomings, it could at least be said, several generations ago, that there was still a residue of idealism among the liberals.

Now, we are only machine politicians bringing out as a matter of ritual—as a way of deceiving the voter—the tattered but honorable flags of yesterday's liberalism—a liberalism which they no longer understand, even in limited form.

It is this moral bankruptcy of the liberal politicians which is causing the young people to move toward the Republican Party. For we are the only party in this country which is free of political obligations to the big-city machines.

The stern, cold fact is that no Democrat can be elected to national office today who is not under deep and unbreakable obligation to the corrupt big-city machines.

This is the cold, chilling fact about the so-called liberals of the North. They cannot break out of this bondage. The modern liberals have made this alliance with the corrupt city machines and the price is no less than their liberalism itself. They cannot go back down this road. They have bartered their ideals in order to gain and keep political power.

This was the death of any genuine liberal movement. It was the beginning of the reign of the hard-bitten opportunists who have preserved only the liberal label.

Because sensitive liberals are aware of the political dead-end of liberalism in this country, they are no longer going into the leadership of the Democratic Party as they once did. In their place are the cynical opportunists who are quite comfortable in their alliance with the big-city politicians. They are satisfied just to make a show of their apparent liberalism from time to time. These opportunists hope to capture a few marginal votes among people who still doggedly keep some hope for liberal politics, in the face of all the facts.

There has developed a great confusion in the use of the terms "liberal" and "conservative" in this country. One of the major reasons for this confusion, in my view, is that the liberal politicians in this country have ceased to be liberal within any customary meaning of this term. And the term "conservative" has been so carefully smeared by a generation of liberal propagandists that they have made it sound like the word "reactionary."

And this brings me to one other aspect of modern liberalism.

I am referring now to its intellectual bankruptcy. I am referring now to the fact that liberalism has lost its bearings. Liberalism has lost its central idea. Liberalism has lost its core of meaning. In a word, liberalism has degenerated intellectually into a vague, mushy kind of sentimentality.

Now perhaps some of you have heard of the little magazine called Partisan Review. It is not read by many people but I am told it is the most influential modern liberal magazine. Modern liberals read it like a Bible.

A leading liberal, Mr. Irving Howe, put it this way in their leading journal. He said this: "To call oneself a liberal one doesn't really have to believe in anything."

I'll say that again: "To call oneself a liberal one doesn't really have to believe in anything."

I believe Mr. Howe is correct. Mr. Howe is a leading authority. I would not argue with this view of modern liberalism.

Now there are a number of catch-words the professional liberals use in place of ideas—words that have very little precise meaning but which serve as useful slogans.

"Conformity" is one of these words. Every respectable liberal stands four-square against "conformity." Well, let's take a look at the meaning of "conformity."

You are young people here. Many of you are only a few years out of college. In fact, some of you are students. You all have fresh memories of college.

Have you ever been on a campus where the overwhelming majority of the faculty considered themselves "liberals"? Have you ever listened to a group of these so-called liberal professors talking among themselves about some nonconformist who happened to be a conservative? It is a fact that these liberal professors often find ways to punish with the greatest severity any colleagues who do not conform to their liberalism. They demand absolute uniformity on this point.

I am willing to say there is no conformity so great as the conformity of the professional liberals.

Let us look at the "way-out" liberals. I am talking about the beatniks. They are the emancipated, you know. They are supposed to be the absolute nonconformists. They are the self-conscious rebels.

You all know the standard uniform of these rebels. It is about as rigidly prescribed as a military uniform. Take, for instance, a female beatnik. Start with the soiled sneakers, the long black stockings. Then the soiled clothing, the pale lipstick, the heavy eye makeup. Finally, there is the long straggly hair.

Then, of course, there is the disillusioned look.

Now I ask you to imagine a party of these liberal beatniks. Now I ask you to imagine that at this time there turns up at this beatnik party a nonconformist girl with clean clothes, clean hair, and not even wearing black stockings or dirty sneakers. This nonconformist girl is even cheerful, which is the unforgivable sin.

Can you imagine the outraged contempt of the uniformed beatniks as they faced this nonconformist?

What I am saying is that there is no demand for conformity in our country which is so severe as is the demand for conformity among the liberals, and this is especially true among the extreme liberals.

It is this sterile conformity among the so-called liberals which is causing the imaginative, energetic, and intelligent young people of this country to turn to the conservatives and to the Republican Party.

Here in the Republican Party we cultivate dissent and dynamic growth. We expect only a decent respect for the best traditions which have been handed down to us by our ancestors, at the cost of much blood, hardship and sacrifice.

Within this great tradition of freedom there is room for the most diverse opinions. In this great Republican Party we cherish a great and rich diversity of talents and points of view.

It is time we realized more clearly that the modern liberals who are hopelessly confined to an economic view of man, who are the helpless captives of the big-city machines of the North, are not only morally bankrupt but they are also intellectually bankrupt.

They have not had a new idea in 30 years.

They are dead and finished.

They are sterile and rigid.

Modern liberalism is only a form of rigor mortis. The old, respectable—sometimes noble—liberalism of 50 years ago is gone for good.

The young people of this Nation are looking to the Republican Party. Only in the Republican Party can the young people now find scope for their idealism, scope for their energy, and scope for their imagination.

BIG BEND DAM CLOSED IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the sixth and final dam in the Missouri Basin development program was closed last week. Water is now being diverted through the enormous power house tunnels adjacent to the dam.

The Big Bend Reservoir will now link up with the reservoirs at Fort Peck, Mont.; Garrison, N. Dak.; Oahe, S. Dak.; Fort Randall, S. Dak.; and Gavins Point, S. Dak.; to comprise the Missouri Basin system. Big Bend Dam, while one of the smallest of the Missouri River structures, will be an important source of electric power and recreation.

I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader of July 24 telling the story of the Big Bend Dam closure.

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

RIVER CLOSED AT BIG BEND DAM

FORT THOMPSON, S. DAK.—The mighty Big Bend Dam, sixth and final dam in the present Missouri Basin development program, was closed Wednesday.

Giant earthmovers and bulldozers shoveled tons of dirt into the Missouri to bridge the final gap in the mammoth earthen structure.

Final phase of the closure will come this fall when the Big Bend embankment, including the diversion dike, is raised to its final elevation of 1,440 feet above sea level.

Closure of the dam sealed off the natural channel of the river and forced the waters through powerhouse tunnels adjoining the dam.

LARGE RESERVOIR

When filled, the Big Bend Reservoir will curl 80 river miles upstream, its waters approaching the base of the giant Oahe Dam at Pierre. The reservoir will have a shoreline of about 200 miles.

Big Bend, one of the smallest of the Missouri River dams, will impound just under 2 million acre-feet of water behind a rolled earth structure 100 feet high and nearly 2 miles long.

The main contribution of the dam will be power generation.

Eight hydroelectric generators, with a total capacity of 458,000 kilowatts, will make Big Bend Dam the second largest power producer in the system.

First power on the line is scheduled next July. All eight units will be completed by April of 1966. Big Bend is presently scheduled for completion by June of 1967.

Big Bend, bordered by the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Indian reservation, is expected to become one of the major recreational areas of central South Dakota.

Big Bend also will provide benefits from flood control, irrigation and downstream navigation.

STARTED IN 1959

Cost of the project is estimated at $112 million. Work at Big Bend was kicked off in August 1959 and is presently in its second stage of earthwork. The dam is one of six authorized by Congress in 1944 under the Picks-Sloan plan.

Nearly 200 spectators, including officials of the U.S. Corps of Engineers which is supervising the project, were present during the closure.

THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to enact a new immigration law which would basically change American immigration policies.

I am heartened that he recognized a compelling need to enact an immigration law that "serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes."

He has proposed a bill which would eliminate altogether the national origins system for allocating quotas; the Asia Pacific triangle; and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

The proposed legislation, S. 1932, also would establish a series of priorities for admission: first, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to individuals already in the country; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving less than 200 or more than 10 percent of previously established quotas.

By seeking an immigration policy reflecting America's ideal of the equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, we would accomplish two purposes:

First. We would enhance America's image as leader of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world, and thus accomplish a significant forward stride in our international relations.

Second. We would recognize the individual worth of each immigrant and his potential contribution to the development and growth of our national economy.

These basic changes in American immigration policy are long overdue. I have, therefore, joined in sponsoring the administration's bill.

Earlier this year I joined in sponsoring a bill, S. 747. Although I feel that both S. 747 and S. 1932 are meritorious and deserve the most careful examination, I feel S. 747 is preferable, for two reasons:

First, S. 747 would allot each nation a definite quota, figured according to a formula which is based on world population ratios and patterns of immigration to the United States during the last 15 years. This quota cannot be reduced unless all other quotas are readjusted under the same formula.

Second, S. 747 does not provide for as much administrative discretion, so that there is less room for the law to be administered in a discriminatory way.

On the other hand, under the President's proposal, existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The power to redistribute quota numbers lies entirely in the hands of the President himself, with the advice and help of a new seven-man immigration board. An extraordinarily wide latitude of discretionary power is thus lodged in the hands of a single person.

In any case, the decision now lies with Congress, which I believe, should explore fully all the implications of both proposals. I am completing an exhaustive study of our immigration laws and policies to present to the Senate in the near future. I shall strongly support efforts to basically revise our immigration laws and policies.

PEACE CORPS RATES HIGH PRAISE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, less than 2 years have elapsed since Congress established a permanent Peace Corps. This is a very short time for any international program to show results. For the Peace Corps, handicapped from the start by a cloud of skepticism, it is a particularly short time.

Yet the Peace Corps has already had unprecedented results in getting the people in underdeveloped nations to help themselves and in creating good will toward Americans and America. It gives me great satisfaction to read the enthusiastic accounts of the work of the Corps appearing in the press. Recent editorials in the Los Angeles Times and the New York Herald Tribune endorse the administration's request for an increased budget for the program and give high praise to the first battalions of the Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 2, 1963]

PEACE CORPS PAY DIVIDENDS

The Peace Corps has requested $108 million for its next year's work, almost double its present $58 million budget.

On its record over the past 2 years, the Peace Corps petition for increased funds seems justified. Indeed, it can be argued that the Peace Corps has made more effec-

tive use of its money than almost any other U.S. agency operating abroad.

As ambassadors of good will, the Peace Corps volunteers have gone into villages over the world, largely as teachers, to guide and to help the villagers to a better life.

They live austerely, far from the plush centers of diplomacy. It costs only $9,000 per year to keep the average Peace Corpsman overseas, demonstrating a record for lean living seldom approached by our other official missions abroad.

That the Peace Corps has been effective is attested by what a sales executive would call repeat business. The countries where they have served are clamoring for expanded Peace Corps programs. They like the product.

There can be little doubt that the U.S. image has been enhanced by the selfless work of the Peace Corps groups at this person-to-person level.

If they can maintain their austere and dedicated purpose, without becoming another fat, complacent Federal bureau going through stereotyped motions, the Peace Corps will continue to be effective. There has been no indication to date of any letdown in the Peace Corps drive.

The country can be proud of their performance. They have earned the aided funds they seek. The relatively minor cost of the Corps has been a sound investment so far.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 8, 1963]

ONWARD PEACEFUL SOLDIERS

The first battalions of the Peace Corps are returning from their respective fronts after 2 years of service overseas. There are no great parades, no waving of flags, not even any audible cheers. Yet these battalions have scored some of the most notable victories in the peacetime history of the Republic.

They have gone into some of the most backward areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to teach young and old how to read and write; to apply the scientific knowledge of the West to the unyielding agricultural soils of the South and the East; to organize community groups to clear slums, build houses, construct roads.

They have won the envy and the enmity of the Communists; and the admiration and affection of the 47 countries in which the 6,869 Peace Corpsmen have been stationed. Day after day, more countries called for more corpsmen.

Could there be a better recommendation to Congress for the increased budget which Director Sargent Shriver has asked for the Corps?

PIONEERS OF CATHOLICISM AND SLOVAK LIFE IN YOUNGSTOWN DIOCESE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Slovak Catholic Sokol concluded its convention in Youngstown, Ohio, recently. At the convention, there was read to those in attendance a history of Slovak life in Youngstown. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PIONEERS OF CATHOLICISM AND SLOVAK LIFE IN YOUNGSTOWN DIOCESE

(By John C. Sciranka)

On the occasion of the 19th national convention and Slet and track and field meet of the Slovak Catholic Sokol which were held in Youngstown, Ohio, from July 11 to 19, 1963, it is timely to review the history of pioneers of Catholicism and Slovak Sokol life in Youngstown diocese.

Although the St. Vincent's archabbey of Latrobe, Pa., is credited as the cradle of Slovak higher education in America and especially for training of priesthood, the State of Ohio gave us first Slovak leaders. However, prior to their arrival to this country, there were others among the Slavonic nations, who have blazed the way.

The first American Slovak leader, who gained national prominence came to Ohio about 1882. He was Stephen Furdek, later ordained Catholic priest, who aided the organization of the first Slovak parish of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Youngstown, Ohio.

Father Furdek was sent to Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia by Bishop Richard Gilmour to recruit seminarians and priests for the work among the American Slovaks in Ohio.

Through the efforts of Father Furdek, Peter V. Rovnianek later known as founder of the first Slovak fraternal organization in America, the National Slovak Society, came to America on September 5, 1888. The first Slovak society in Youngstown, Ohio, known as Assembly 8, under the patronage of SS. Cyril and Methodius, whose 11th centenary we are observing this year and special tribute was paid them by this Sokol convention, was organized here on March 16, 1890, with 20 members.

However, before going into the Youngstown Slovak history, it is proper to show that other Slavs have blazed the way in this territory.

In 1770 Jacob Sadowski and his sons were among the first pioneers to come from New Cork to Kentucky and the city of Sandusky, Ohio, is named after them. We have also Poland Manor here.

Prior to them a Moravian Slovak missionary, Frederick Post, who is credited with starting the city of Pittsburgh, lived for a while among the Indians in Ohio. However, it was Rev. Frederick Baraga, born on June 29, 1797, in Slovenia, present Yugoslavia, who after ordination to priesthood on September 21, 1823, fulfilled his desire to come to America to work among the Indians. Father Baraga started for the new land on October 29, 1830, and landed in New York on December 31, 1830. He proceeded to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he was received by the first Bishop of Ohio, the Most Rev. Edward Fenwick.

Father Baraga stayed with Bishop Fenwick until the spring of 1831. During the winter he labored among the German and Slav speaking people of Cincinnati.

Bishop Fenwick had a very interesting career. He was an American, who belonged to a Dominican Order in Kentucky. He came to Ohio in 1814 and was one of the first priests to labor in Ohio besides the Jesuit Fathers, who worked among the Hurons. Father Fenwick celebrated mass under a large tree in Canton, Ohio, in 1817. Father Fenwick was consecrated bishop on January 13, 1822. His cathedral in Cincinnati, Ohio, consisted of a log cabin and an attic, which served as his episcopal residence. But while moving his church, it fell apart. He was discouraged and went to Rome, where Pope Leo XII, refused to accept his resignation and he returned back to his diocese. In 1832 he died during the cholera epidemic on September 26, 1833, at Wooster, near Canton, Ohio. Bishop Fenwick was informed about the Slovaks and the Slavs from Father Baraga, who studied in Vienna, and later became first bishop of Marquette, Mich. Due to his efforts, many seminarians and priests came from present Yugoslavia to America and several of them became bishops in Minnesota. Even Bishop Baraga's sister came to aid him. She—a noblewoman—worked among the Indians and taught their children until she took ill and moved to Philadelphia, where she founded a school for girls. She also founded the Order of Slovenian Sisters, who later taught in parochial schools. Bishop Baraga is a candidate for sainthood.

Another great bishop of Ohio of Bohemian origin was Most Rev. Joseph M. Koudelka, who became auxiliary bishop in 1907 in Cleveland, Ohio, and gave missions among the Slovaks. He died in Superior, Wis.

The first Slovaks came to Youngstown, according to Matthew Mraz, Msgr. Oldrich Zlamal, John A. Willo and Rev. Joseph L. Kostik, who delved into the Slovak history of this region, before 1878. In that year John Hamrak, the father of present Msgr. John G. Hamrak, Martin Farkas, J. Zabrinsky were already settled here. In 1890 they formed a society of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which became assembly 8 of the mentioned National Slovak Society. This is the oldest Slovak society in Youngstown.

Martin Seman, J. Tomajko, Michael Willo, John Sefcik, Stephen Franko, Matthew Melega, A. Jancar, John Babik, Paul Puklas, Michael Murar, John Cuj, John Knapik, Michael Ondrusko and Andrew Olejnik are some of the early pioneers.

In 1910 Rev. Oldrich Zlamal, who was pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Parish, organized the Youngstown Slovak News, which was published here for about 20 years and edited first by Father Zlamal Milan Salva, and later by Matthew Mraz. The Slovaks had also two financial institutions. The Youngstown State Bank and Youngtown Home Savings Co., whose president was the late Michael Willo, father of one of the first Slovak lawyers, John A. Willo.

The Slovak Catholic Parish of SS. Cyril and Methodius was founded on May 19, 1896. John Smigovsky, Martin Kramer, Joseph Rusinak and Michael Willo were the first committee for the organization of the parish. Msgr. John W. Klute aided them and Father Furdek also attended the first organization meeting called by the St. Martin's society. John Begalla, the father of Msgr. Begalla, was among the first collectors for the new church. Others were Stephen Smigovsky, Andrew Rys and Stephen Franko.

Rev. A. Kollar, followed by Rev. J. Becka were the first priests. They were followed by Rev. Joseph Novak, who died here on June 30, 1908. Father Zlamal became pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius parish and aided much in organizing other Slovak parishes. Rev. John M. Liscinsky was a noted leader, writer and publisher. While the first priests were Czechs, who spoke the Slovak language, Father Liscinsky was a Slovak.

Founding of other Slovak churches followed; namely, Holy Trinity, Struthers, Ohio, whose first pastor was Rev. Paul Herman and Rev. Melchoir Furst. Due to shortage of Slovak priests, clergymen of other nationalities served the people.

The Slovak Lutherans founded their parish of John Hus in 1903. Their present pastor is Rev. J. Roh. The Slovak Presbyterians founded their parish on January 4, 1911. Rev. M. J. Tomasula and others labored in this congregation.

In sequence the Holy Name Slovak Catholic Church was established on January 18, 1914. The laymen who labored for the parish are: John Roth, Matthew Kucko, Martin Dolak, and Joseph Lipjanec. Rev. J. Stipanovic, a Croatian, one of the successors of Bishop Baraga, was its first pastor followed by Rev. Francis J. Dubosh, now monsignor and protonotary apostolic of Lakewood, Ohio. After him Msgr. Stephen G. Kocis established a great record. Msgr. Stephen G. Kocis established a great record. Msgr. Stephen W. Begalla is a present pastor. Campbell, Ohio, had organized a Slovak Baptist Church in 1907 by John Kana, who later became a copublisher of New York Daily Slovak paper. The late Rev. M. Hiben worked in this congregation.

This was followed by organization of the St. Matthias Slovak Catholic Church in 1913. Rev. J. Gerenda was its first pastor followed by Rev. Francis Kozelek. The present pastor is Msgr. John G. Hamrak.

St. John the Baptist Slovak Parish of Campbell, Ohio, had a very hard beginning. It was founded in 1914 and continued to grow under the leadership of Rev. John W. Krispinsky, Msgr. John Hamrak, Rev. George Novák, Rev. P. Sikora, and the present pastor, Msgr. Michael M. Tondora.

The Slovak Lutheran Church of Emmanuel was founded on July 30, 1922. Rev. Andrew Hvidzdzak, Rev. L. A. Jarosi, Rev. John Zornan, and Rev. M. D. Marcis are some of its pastors.

The last of the Slovak parishes to be organized is St. Elizabeths at Campbell, of which Rev. Joseph L. Kostik is pastor since April 22, 1922. After many struggles he built one of the most beautiful churches in this valley.

There is also SS. Cyril and Methodius Parish at Warren, Ohio, which was founded in July 1928 when the late Bishop Joseph Schrembs sent Rev. George Bobal for its first pastor. Father Bobal was followed by Rev. John M. Kandrac. The present pastor, Msgr. Joseph A. Krispinsky, VF, built a beautiful church, which was dedicated on May 21, 1950, by the late Bishop James A. McFadden.

The youngest of the Slovak parishes in the Youngstown diocese is St. Joseph Parish, Newton Falls, Ohio, which was founded in 1923. Rev. Francis Tomanek was first pastor followed by Rev. George Bobal, Rev. John M. Kandrac, Father Schafer, Rev. John M. Liscinsky, and the present pastor Rev. Albert Klein.

The Slovak parishes have given many priests and Sisters to the church.

The Slovak Franciscan Fathers established a friary at Columbia, Ohio, with plans for a minor seminary. The present prior is Rev. Bonaventure Babik, OFM.

The Slovak Catholic Sokol was founded in this area in August 1908, when assembly 26 was organized in what is now Campbell, Ohio. In 1910 the junior assembly 6 was founded here. Later Anton M. Palkovic was elected supreme president of the organization. Rev. Martin B. Rubicky of Struthers and later of Clairton, Pa., was active here and is buried in this city. He was the supreme chaplain of our Sokol. The late John Janci was supreme auditor of the Sokol. Joseph L. Maruskin was supreme commander. The present supreme officers are Stephen R. Olenick, supreme auditor; John A. Olejar, supreme vice president and Mrs. Helen Sapara, member of supreme court. There are other Slovak fraternalists like Mrs. Mary Slifka, Mrs. M. Kubina, Mrs. Mary Dolak, Mr. J. Schromovsky, Mr. Palenchar, George Varga, and G. Vaschak, who deserve mention.

Attorney Theodore Macejko is supreme counselor for the First Catholic Slovak Union. Then there is Mrs. A. Jablonsky of the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union and former Slovak Catholic Sokol supreme officers, namely Mrs. Ann Roth, Mrs. M. Magda, and Michael Palkovic, who deserve mention.

This is but a brief summary of Slovak pioneers and fraternal leaders, to whom we paid tribute during this Slovak Catholic Sokol convention hoping that new leaders will be inspired to carry on the work of our predecessors.

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, recently completed a good will trip to Japan. While there he was favorably impressed with the activities of the U.S. Travel Service in that country.

Upon his return, the Governor wrote a letter to Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service. I respectfully request permission to have the Governor's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 13, 1963.

Mr. VOIT GILMORE,
Director, U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILMORE: As you know, I was able to spend considerable time in Japan several weeks ago during the Hawaiian Festival promotion then in progress. During my visit I had a fine opportunity to study the operations of the U.S. Travel Service.

I must say that I was impressed with the "Visit U.S.A." program being conducted by your Tokyo office. From personal observation and through talks with the Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer, our Ambassador to Japan, as well as with other officials and travel industry representatives, I was pleased to learn that the "Visit U.S.A." program was well publicized throughout the length and breadth of Japan.

Your program in Japan is being conducted in a vigorous and effective fashion. I am sure we will see a vivid demonstration of this next spring when currency restrictions on pleasure travel are relaxed and the surge of travel from Japan to Hawaii and the U.S. mainland at long last begins.

You and the staff of the U.S. Travel Service are performing a valuable service for the people of America. You have my best wishes for continuing success and an expanded program in the future.

With warmest personal regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BURNS,
Governor of Hawaii.

THE LAW AS IT AFFECTS DESEGREGATION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much has already been written about the need for civil rights legislation this session of Congress. Much more will be written before Congress adjourns sometime this fall. While there is no dearth of material dealing with this critical national issue, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a frank and forthright essay, "The Law as it Affects Desegregation: Implications of the Supreme Court Decision," prepared by Miss Pauli Murray, tutor of law, Yale University Law School. This essay was delivered at the Radcliffe Alumnae College, June 14, 1963, in Cambridge, Mass.

Miss Murray has served as visiting professor of law at the Ghana School of Law and is the author of "States' Laws on Race and Color" and coauthor of the "Constitution and Government of Ghana." Aside from these qualifications, Miss Murray notes that she was one of the earlier generation of freedom riders when the struggle for equality was a far more lonely one, and a leader of successful nonviolent sit-in demonstrations in Washington restaurants exactly 20 years ago. Thus Miss Murray freely admits to a certain lack of scholarly objectivity when she writes of the current civil rights crisis.

Nevertheless in this essay Miss Murray achieves a remarkable combination of personal involvement and legal objectivity. She examines four major questions: First, what is the central issue in the present conflict? Second, what has been the role of the law, and particularly of the courts, in resolving this issue? Third, what are the new factors which demand new solutions? Fourth, what is the role of the law in solving the present crisis?

Miss Murray's essay was written prior to President Kennedy's historic message on civil rights and consequently she was unable to consider these proposals in her analysis. While this paper represents only the views and opinions of the author, it is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this essay be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE LAW AS IT AFFECTS DESEGREGATION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

INTRODUCTION

During the past several weeks, American Negroes have confronted the Nation with what has been described as a "massive insistence" upon drastic changes in the social structure to achieve rapid and total integration. They have abandoned their traditional role of patience; they have rejected tokenism and gradualism; they are saying, "One hundred years of fractional citizenship is enough. We want full citizenship now."

This mood pervades the entire Negro community as seen in the tremendous outpouring of hundreds to tens of thousands of Negroes into the streets of the Nation. Police violence, kicking, beating, the use of fierce dogs and fire hoses, even murder—none of these has stopped them. For the 7-day period ending June 2, an estimated more than 30 demonstrations took place in widely separated areas of the country. A week later, the New York Times reported that demonstrations had occurred in nearly 50 localities since May 1. This week has been marked by defiance of the Governor of Alabama in a confrontation with the Federal Government, a televised appeal to the Nation by President Kennedy and the fatal shooting in the back of an NAACP official in Mississippi. Clearly, this is our most serious domestic crisis since the Civil War.

Describing it as the "Second American Revolution," the Washington Star editorialized on June 2 that the real problem in this situation is—

"* * * how best to cope wisely with a rapidly developing revolution. The current outbreak of mass demonstrations by Negroes * * * is a manifestation of as genuine and justified revolution as any of the revolutions in history, history being largely an account of a sequence of revolutions."

Actually, we are experiencing the climax of a phase of the continuing social revolution in the United States which began with our Declaration of Independence and our war to throw off colonial rule. Periodically our country has been thrown into convulsions as various groups of the population have taken the initiative in reaffirming their fundamental rights and freedoms. These upsurges have been part of the growth and maturing of our democracy.

Now in the 1960's, Negroes are engaged in a desperate effort to end segregation and discrimination everywhere in the United States. All the evidence indicates that they will not be stopped short of their goal. President Kennedy correctly placed this struggle in its proper historical perspective, when

he observed in his recent Vanderbilt University address, that it was in the best American tradition.

The issues involved in this confrontation are moral as well as legal; the alternatives have become total equality or total repression, and there is no turning back. Each of us is caught up in an atmosphere of impending conflict, of a mounting urgency to come to fundamental grips with our most longstanding and explosive domestic issue and one which rates high priority among the most crucial issues of our foreign policy.

At this turning point of our history, I find it difficult to maintain a balance between academic objectivity and deep personal emotional involvement. As one of an earlier generation of freedom riders with a prison sentence as a reminder of the days when the struggle was a lonely one, and as a student leader of successful nonviolent sit-in demonstrations in Washington restaurants exactly 20 years ago, I cannot pretend a scholarly detachment from these events.

In our time we are being compelled to return to our revolutionary roots. Potential violence has been inherent in this issue from the beginning of our history. I am glad that this long unsettled business of democracy is now coming to a head. I rejoice that Negroes in ever greater numbers are today standing where the American patriots stood in 1776; that they are now willing more than ever to risk their lives for personal liberty and human dignity. They are reenacting the American Revolution in 20th century form. I believe that if the American people as a whole could identify Negroes with our revolutionary traditions of liberty, we will have taken the first significant step toward eliminating the schism which has so divided and almost destroyed us as a nation in the past.

This revolutionary upheaval has not come about through formal decision of any single group, but through a consensus made up of individual commitment by thousands of people taking a stand, igniting and inspiring others to do the same. Many of the demonstrations have been planned; others are spontaneous. Out of this personal commitment to the struggle for liberty is emerging a new self-image, a new self-respect. And if I read the signs correctly, the Nation is gaining a new image of the Negro, for it is our tradition that when people have self-respect, nothing can keep them from asserting the inalienable rights of free men, women, and children.

I emphasize children here, for in reality, Negro children in the South, for the past 9 years, have led the crusade for human dignity. I need not remind you of the children who have braved hostile communities to exercise their right to attend nonsegregated schools. You are aware of the Birmingham children who recently, as if by prearranged signal, marched out of a school assembly and into the streets to demonstrate for their rights leaving an astonished faculty and an empty school building. You have doubtless read of the schoolchildren of Mississippi carrying signs directed to their adults which read: "We have gone to jail for you. Will you register and vote for us?"

In Washington, one of my friends is having difficulty with her teenaged son who remonstrates with her because she has not let him join some of the demonstrations in nearby Maryland. He feels ashamed because his cousin—a mere girl—has already demonstrated, been arrested and taken to prison. This fire and idealism among Negro schoolchildren today is so intense that their parents are left no alternative but to join the demonstrations themselves to maintain their honor and their children's respect.

By now, it must be clear to all of us that, for the second time in our Nation's history, we stand on the threshold of a major decision on human rights of the most fundamental character. In 1963 it has been forcefully brought home to us that our Nation cannot endure with fractional degrees of equality or citizenship. The right to human dignity is indivisible.

Against this background, let us address ourselves to the following questions: (1) What is the central issue in the present conflict? (2) What has been the role in the law, and particularly of the courts, in resolving this issue? (3) What are the new factors which demand new solutions? (4) What is the role of the law in solving the present crisis? In approaching these questions, we must continually bear in mind that the law operates in a moral climate and reflects that climate.

I. THE CENTRAL ISSUE IN THE RACIAL CRISIS

As a point of departure, let me tell a story which seems relevant. I have a friend who would be described as a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant and who lives in suburbia. One day her little girl came home from school weeping uncontrollably and her mother was unable to get her to tell what happened. So the mother went to school to investigate. She learned that her daughter's playmates had refused to let her join a ropeskipping game. She was a fat little girl and not a good ropeskipper, but what really broke her heart was that the other children would not even let her hold the rope and turn it for others to skip. When she could talk about it she told her mother, "Mommy, what hurt me so was that they wouldn't even let me be a steady-ender."

The exclusion from participation as an equal with one's fellows, in work and in play in any society, makes one an outcast. It robs the individual of a feeling of personal worth and of belonging. The permanent effects of such exclusion may be apathy, self-depreciation, violence and aggression, stunted growth, lack of ambition, or sometimes refuge in the exclusion itself as an excuse for poor performance.

In the language of my friend's little daughter, for three centuries the Negro has not even been allowed to be a "steady-ender" in American life. It is against the crushing weight of these three centuries, and against a background of a world revolution in human rights that Negroes now rebel in mass upheavals. Dr. Martin Luther King has explained this mood of impatience as a father who finds it difficult to wait for promises.

"When you suddenly find * * * your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?' "

The central issue in this rebellion is human dignity—the inherent rights of free men and women. This issue is not merely the American dream: it is the foundation of our society. We cannot reaffirm too often the principle upon which our Nation stands or falls:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness."

These rights are entrenched in the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, they are not only inherent in our beings; they are also guaranteed by our fundamental law and placed beyond the reach of transient legislative majorities. No government can rightfully take them away or permit others to impair them.

II. THE ROLE OF THE LAW AND THE COURTS

In the American legal system, as you know, the Supreme Court has the function and the authority of ultimately interpreting and applying the constitutional principles underlying guaranteed rights to myriad fact situations, and of adjudicating between various rights if they are in conflict. Having declared what the supreme law is, the Court's interpretation is binding upon all the people. Hence, we say that our society is based upon the rule of law and not upon the rule of men.

From its inception, however, our fundamental law contained an irreconcilable contradiction, in that the same basic document which affirmed basic human rights also recognized the institution of slavery—the complete denial of these rights to some men. How was this intolerable contradiction in the law to be resolved?

In 1857, Chief Justice Taney of the Supreme Court attempted to resolve it in the Dred Scott case by determining that some human beings have inherent rights and others do not. He concluded that Negroes were not intended to be included in the Declaration of Independence or in the term "people" in the opening phrase of our Constitution—"We the People of the United States"; nor were any persons of African descent, whether slave or free, intended to be citizens of the United States; "that they had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior race, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." Thus, according to Taney, the framers of the Declaration of Independence "knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world, be supposed to embrace the Negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery."

This attempt by the Supreme Court to resolve the issue by exclusion did much to make the conflict irrepressible. When the supreme law of the land is consistent with human dignity, controversies as to which rights are paramount can be determined peacefully within the orderly legal processes of our constitutional system. History has shown again and again, that when the fundamental law is interpreted in such a way as to be inconsistent with human dignity, conflict is inevitable.

After a bitter Civil War of 4 years, the Nation reaffirmed and made more explicit inherent human rights in the form of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Congress was expressly given the power to enforce these amendments by appropriate legislation. The purpose of this constitutional change was to sweep away all political and legal barriers to the exercise of equal rights with all other citizens.

Since the institution of slavery had been supported by detailed legislation in the various slaveowning States, and since these formerly rebellious States attempted to reenslave Negroes through the enactment of the black codes after the war, the thrust of the 14th amendment was against State action. That amendment provides in part:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It was clear to the framers of the Reconstruction amendments that Federal protection was necessary for the full and free exercise of citizenship rights. In the 10 years following the Civil War, it also became clear that these rights had to be protected from violation by private persons as well as by State action. These rights also had to be protected uniformly throughout the United States, if citizenship was to be meaningful. Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which declared in part:

"That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters and other places of public amusement; subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, and applicable to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude."

The act made it a misdemeanor for any person to violate the law by denying to any citizen the full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations, and granted a civil remedy of damages up to $500 to persons aggrieved by such denial.

What was not sufficiently clear to Congress or to the Nation at the time of Reconstruction was that the institution of slavery over a period of two centuries had had a dehumanizing effect upon blacks and whites alike in the entire region where it had become entrenched and had affected the moral climate of the Nation as a whole. A national effort of rehabilitation and restoration of the dignity of impoverished whites and newly freed Negroes in the former slaveowning States ravaged by war was essential if the Nation was to recover from this dehumanization. This was not done. The Freedmen's Bureau, created at the end of the war to give relief to the needy Negroes and whites in the conquered South, was imperfectly conceived, poorly administered and short lived, lasting only 7 years. What was sorely needed was a 19th century version of UNRRA or Marshall plan for the South. The absence of such planning set in motion forces of reaction, and we are today reaping the whirlwind of those forces.

At the judicial level, there followed perhaps the most inglorious period in our history with reference to human rights. Judges of the Supreme Court were conditioned by the same attitudes which produced the Dred Scott case; the majority of the Court found it expedient narrowly to interpret the Reconstruction amendments, permitting the Nation to drift backward instead of marching forward. Bit by bit the Court whittled down the broad protection of these amendments. First, it limited the concept of "privileges and immunities" in the 14th amendment and the rights which flow out of Federal citizenship. In light of the current issue of desegregation, two of the Court's important decisions are relevant to our discussion.

In the famous civil rights cases of 1883, the Court, by an 8-to-1 decision, declared that the Civil Rights Act of 1875, prohibiting discrimination by private persons in places of public accommodation throughout the country, was unconstitutional and void on the ground that Congress had no power to enact legislation operative upon individuals in this field under either the 13th or 14th amendments. While it conceded that the language of the 13th amendment was broad enough to reach individuals, it rejected the argument that the 13th amendment was intended to abolish not only the technical legal relationship of master and slave but also all of the incidents of slavery and the badges of inferiority the institution had imposed upon Negroes, whether slave or free. The Court also held that the 14th amendment applied only to State action and not to individual invasion of private rights. Presumably, suggested the Court, these rights could be protected by resort to the laws of the various States.

Mr. Justice John M. Harlan, a former slaveowner from Kentucky who had bitterly opposed the abolition of slavery before the war but who was dedicated to the supremacy of the Constitution, wrote an eloquent and masterful dissent on both of these points and left a beacon light to guide future lawyers upholding human rights. In light of the President's speech on Tuesday night calling for another Federal statute on public accommodations, Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent warrants rereading today. Unquestionably, the decision in the civil rights cases opened the door to widespread discrimination by private persons against Negroes, leaving the protection of the most basic aspect of human dignity—the right not to be humiliated by unequal and exclusionary treatment—to the whim of the various States. In my opinion, the civil rights cases were wrongly decided and are an important factor in the current unrest. As late as 1959, the Supreme Court refused to reexamine a case brought under the 1875 act. Around the same time several lower Federal courts also denied the applicability of this act to restaurants on interstate highways. Having no remedy in the courts, as President Kennedy aptly pointed out in his nationwide address, Negroes took the issue into the streets. It is significant that the first mass sit-in cases arose in early 1960 following the latest refusal of the Supreme Court to declare an available remedy.

In 1896, the Supreme Court decided the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and upheld the constitutionality of a Louisiana statute which provided separate railway cars for Negroes and whites in circumstances (a) where regulating intrastate commerce and (b) where such accommodations were "separate but equal." Here the Court denied the view that a segregation statute implied inferiority of Negroes. Although it conceded that the object of the 14th amendment was to establish absolute legal equality, it held the amendment was not intended to abolish distinctions based upon color. Again Mr. Justice Harlan dissented vigorously. His reasoning against the background of contemporary events has been proven to be eminently sound. His words were prophetic. He wrote:

"In my opinion, the judgment this day rendered will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the *Dred Scott* case. * * * What can more certainly arouse race hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distrust between these races, than State enactments which in fact proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens? * * * The sure guarantee of the peace and security of each race is the clear, distinct, unconditional recognition by our Governments, National and State, of every right that inheres in civil freedom, and of the equality before the law of all citizens of the United States without regard to race. State enactments, regulating the enjoyment of civil rights, upon the basis of race, and cunningly devised to defeat legitimate results of the war, under the pretense of recognizing equality of rights, can have no other result than to render permanent peace impossible and to keep alive a conflict of races, the continuance of which must do harm to all concerned."

The Plessy decision opened the door to massive segregation laws in the Southern States and various degrees of permissive segregation in other areas. Legislative intervention in many Northern States following this decision took the form of State civil rights statutes forbidding discrimination in public accommodations. These laws, however, varied as to places covered and as to degree of enforcement.

Distinction and exclusion on grounds of race and color became fixed in our law. As late as 1927, the Supreme Court upheld a Mississippi court ruling that it could constitutionally segregate children "of the brown, yellow, and black races" from white children in the public schools, and denied a child of Chinese ancestry the right to enroll in white schools in that State.

Rigid enforcement of segregation laws in the South, desolutory enforcement of civil rights laws in the North and West, constituted the posture of the country with reference to racial segregation as it moved toward World War II. With the exception of a 1917 decision outlawing a Louisville ordinance which, in effect, created residential segregation, the Court showed no inclination to question legally enforced segregation.

Beginning in 1938 with an attack on the exclusion of Negroes from the State universities of the South, the Court, in a case-by-case approach began the task of realining the law with our fundamental constitutional principles. In 1946, it struck down segregation on interstate carriers, incidentally, declaring void as to interstate passengers, the Virginia statute under which I was arrested and imprisoned 6 years earlier. Bit by bit it overturned the barriers erected on the legal foundation of the Plessy case, but it was not wholly clear until the school desegregation cases of 1954 that the Court was deciding foursquare on the issue of inherent and constitutionally entrenched human rights and their incompatibility with legal segregation. Here the Court met the real issue in the following words:

"Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. * * * To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

With this decision, the Supreme Court sounded the death knell of all segregation where the exercise of state power is involved. Since 1954, that Court has handed down numerous decisions reiterating and applying the basic principle of that case, ordering desegregation of State or municipal public facilities, and more recently, reversing convictions of sit-in demonstrators and their leaders under trespass, and other statutes in cases where a local segregation ordinance was present, or local officials voiced a policy of segregation. The Court put over for further argument a case in which there is no segregation law or ordinance or no declared official policy of segregation, and yet sit-in demonstrators are arrested for trespass at the request of the owner of a place open to the public. Thus, by radical surgery in a series of operations, the "separate but equal" doctrine on grounds of race has been removed from our constitutional law. What remains to be decided or legislated is an affirmative remedy for privately enforced segregation or exclusion from public facilities.

III. THE NEW FACTORS WHICH DEMAND NEW SOLUTIONS

With the Supreme Court giving this reaffirmation of basic rights and slowly correcting the earlier deviations from our funda-

mental law, why have we suddenly found ourselves in a national crisis? This present explosion, of course, is not sudden. Warnings by Negro leadership have been sounded for years, but most of the Nation has been too preoccupied to listen. One important factor is the difference in outlook and tempo between Negroes and the rest of the Nation with respect to the central issue. As Dr. Ralph Bunche pointed out last week, no government ever does enough when people are denied their basic rights. The Nation has been looking at how far Negroes have come in the past two decades, while Negroes, on the other hand, are looking at how far they have to go. They see the slow pace of desegregation—four-tenths of 1 percent of Negro children attending desegregated schools in the 11 States of the old Confederacy 9 years after the Supreme Court decision. They look at their limited employment opportunities, their disproportionately high rate of unemployment, the de facto school segregation in the North which is just as damaging to the personalities of their children as the legally enforced segregation condemned by the Supreme Court in 1954. They find their way out of the ghetto to decent integrated housing blocked by various devices, one of which was used in the infamous Deerfield, Ill., case where local authorities in collusion with certain local residents condemned an integrated housing project in process of being built and took over the land for public parks. They experience the daily affronts and humiliations with reference to exclusion from public facilities. The very fact that important improvements have been made in recent years has whetted the appetite for total inclusion. It is axiomatic that the closer one gets to one's goal of human dignity, the more intolerable become the remaining indignities.

A second factor is the rise of a generation of Negroes born during or since World War II into a climate of opinion in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights represents the common aspirations of peoples everywhere and into a world of revolutionary upsurge of colonial peoples against foreign rule with its implications of racial superiority. This generation has grown up in an atmosphere of incredible speed of events. Gradualism and patience form no part of its heritage, as those of you with children readily appreciate.

A third factor is that by accepting gradualism as the timetable for the solution of this problem, we have permitted the gains of a bloodless social revolution to be threatened by a violent counterrevolution. My good friend, Dr. Caroline F. Ware, social historian and a Ph. D. from Radcliffe, constantly reminds me that social revolutions are not violent; that violence comes into play after social change has occurred or is plainly in sight, and counterrevolutionary efforts are then made to turn the clock back.

What is new about the present revolt is the realization by many Negroes that there is an effective answer to violence and an effective alternative to sullen endurance. There is a new consciousness of strength pervading the whole of the Negro community, a total involvement including children and a mass reaction to the problem.

Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders of his type have been able to harness seething revolt to organized, disciplined, nonviolent direct action. The legal implications of this action are that it is within the protection of freedom of expression guaranteed by the first amendment. The moral implications are, in my opinion, far more significant.

There is a growing national consensus that racial discrimination is essentially a moral problem. If so, it must be attacked at the moral as well as legal level. Nonviolent direct action is based upon the conviction that in social conflict, the power of the spirit is stronger and more enduring than the power of force in a physical contest. By discipline of the spirit, the nonviolent demonstrator determines that violence, if at all, will be on only one side of the controversy. Thus, the demonstrator exercises a certain amount of control over the conflict situation because he eliminates or reduces the immediate provocation to retaliate and transfers the struggle to the conscience of the opponent. He believes that the opponent's hatred, if given only itself to feed upon, must eventually run its course and that, in these circumstances, reconciliation is more possible after the conflict has been resolved. The Negroes have seen this method work with Ghandi in India and have adapted it to peculiarly American situations. Where this method has consciously been used in the demonstrations, despite indignities on the part of the police, violence has been minimized.

As Dr. King wrote in his book, "Stride Toward Freedom":

"We will match your capacity to inflict suffering with our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws. Do to us what you will and we will still love you. Bomb our homes and threaten our children; send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities and drag us out on some wayside road, beating us and leaving us half dead, and we will still love you. But we will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process."

The wider significance of these nonviolent demonstrations by Negroes and their white supporters is that they have brought together two revolutionary ideas: the equality of the rights of man and the assertion of those rights through a spiritually and morally powerful nonviolent technique. They are outpacing the application of the law and making a creative contribution to rapid social change with a minimum of violence. Historians may well record this as one of the important social developments of the 20th century. Nonviolence has filled the vacuum between the declaration and the implementation of the fundamental law.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE LAW IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

At the beginning of our discussion, I said that we are a society built upon the rule of law and not rule by the passions of men. What, then, is the role of the law in resolving the current conflict?

It cannot be too strongly emphasized here that the history of race relations in the United States has proven conclusively that the right to be free from discrimination because of race or color—and I might add sex—is so crucial to human dignity and the exercise of the rights of citizenship, that we have been tragically wrong to leave the protection of this right in so large degree to local regulation. Local laws and policies can supplement but not substitute for a clearly formulated and enforceable National policy binding upon all persons.

The public humiliations which do such violence to human dignity are dramatized by laws, customs, and attitudes of exclusion in places of public accommodation, and amusement. Congress rightly saw in 1875 that this issue was so important it must be resolved in a manner which operated uniformly throughout the United States. It recognized that there could be no piecemeal or fractional coverage in a matter which involves such explosive human emotions. And so it granted total coverage.

Negroes have lived too long with uncertainty to make the recognition of their rights dependent upon any other individual's degree of color-blindness, or whether he operates in interstate or local commerce. The quest for certainty is at the bottom of the present revolt. As Martin Luther King, replying from an Alabama prison to the statement of local white religious leaders that the Birmingham demonstrations were "unwise and untimely," put it:

"I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the sting of darts of segregation to say 'wait.' But when you take a cross country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness'—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait."

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS IN AMERICA: A FURTHER INSTALLMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I announced that periodically I would call to the attention of the Senate the encouraging news of civil rights progress in the United States.

It is just as important to report the hopeful and optimistic news as it is to acknowledge the hard facts of civil discord and discrimination that still exist in all sections of the Nation. Much remains to be accomplished—to be sure—but we should not overly minimize the definite progress that has been achieved.

One of the clearest, firmest, and most impelling voices calling for such continued progress belongs to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. At Gettysburg and again at the Governors' conference, the Vice President raised the moral imperative of prompt action by private persons and at all levels of government to guarantee equality and justice for all Americans.

The Washington Post recently published an editorial praising the Vice President for his courageous leadership in the cause of civil rights. This editorial commendation is thoroughly merited and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the July 27 edition of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, the mayor of Atlanta, Ga., the Honorable Ivan Allen, Jr., delivered a most moving and courageous statement in behalf of racial justice in his testimony before the Commerce Committee.

Obviously the mayor of Atlanta comes before the Congress with excellent credentials to speak in behalf of the President's civil rights legislation. Atlanta has achieved a measure of desegregation of public accommodations, facilities, and schools that serves as evidence of what is possible when men of good will sit down together and seek mutually beneficial arrangements to banish segregation and discrimination from a community.

The mayor of Atlanta has told the Congress to finish the job started a century ago with the Emancipation Proclamation. I devoutly hope that Congress will heed the advice of this outstanding public servant and statesman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial praising Mayor Allen printed in yesterday's New York

Times be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1963]

A POWERFUL ADVOCATE

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has been speaking out on civil rights issues with increasing frequency, force, and clarity. He is doing a great deal to shape public opinion and alter public outlook. Frequently he gets to the gist of the matter with a directness and vigor that pierces the fog of legal dispute into which we so frequently become mired. In his address at the Governors' conference in Miami he made his point with a paragraph notable for its moral tone and simple eloquence:

"Whatever the legalisms or traditions, it is wrong that the tax-paying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans should be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society. Whatever the reasons, it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside the children of other Americans."

The Presidency always has been known as a great platform from which to appeal to the mind and heart of America. The Vice Presidency is being made into a great platform by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

ATLANTA'S MAYOR SPEAKS

On rare occasions the oratorical fog on Capitol Hill is pierced by a voice resonant with courage and dignity. Such a voice was heard when Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta, testified before the Senate Commerce Committee in support of President Kennedy's bill to prohibit racial discrimination in stores, restaurants, and other public accommodations.

On the basis of the very substantial accomplishments that his city of a half million, the largest in the Southeast, has made in desegregating publicly owned and privately owned facilities, he might have come as a champion of States rights and of the ability of localities to banish discrimination without Federal law. Certainly, he would have had much more warrant to espouse that view than the Barnetts, the Wallaces, and the other archsegregationists who raise the specter of Federal "usurpation" as a device for keeping southern Negroes in subjection.

But Mr. Allen was not in Washington to boast. He was there to warn that even in cities like Atlanta the progress that had been made might be wiped out if Congress turned its back on the Kennedy proposal and thus gave implied endorsement to the concept that private businesses were free to discriminate. He left behind this charge to finish the job started with the Emancipation Proclamation a century ago: "Now the elimination of segregation, which is slavery's stepchild, is a challenge to all of us to make every American free in fact as well as in theory—and again to establish our Nation as the true champion of the free world."

THE CRISIS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this mail over the weekend I have received from Mr. Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and editor of Partners magazine a copy of the editorial which Mr. Franks is going to have in the next issue of the magazine.

Because this editorial is so timely in view of impending congressional consideration of legislation effecting the crisis in the railroad industry, I called Mr. Franks, requesting permission to have this editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to its publication in the forthcoming edition of Partners magazine. Mr. Franks granted his consent and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD for all my colleagues' information.

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

THE CRISIS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE NEED FOR STATUTORY DEFINITION OF ITS FUNCTIONAL DOMAIN

(By Maurice R. Franks)

The 4-year-old railroad work rules dispute which today has culminated in the threat of a disastrous nationwide rail strike next Tuesday, points to the need for clarification by act of Congress just what constitutes the legitimate domain of collective bargaining and what in all common sense and economic justice lies outside its proper bounds.

Although collective bargaining is one of the proudest institutions of a free society like ours, the obviously required surveys have yet to be made and lines defining and delimiting the legitimate province have yet to be established. Instead, an unruly expansion by means of creeping encroachment has been allowed to take place. Labor unions, encouraged by successive triumphs in that direction and strengthened in their determination to pursue such advances by the sanctioning thereof by shortsighted and politically oriented NLRB rulings, have gradually extended the concept of conditions of employment—established by law as negotiable—to include the employer's very right to manage his enterprise in lines of sound business acumen.

So long as this process has continued—as for well over a decade it has—and unions have devoted themselves to a creeping invasion of management, more and more difficulties were set in the way of successful collective bargaining, more and more negotiations became deadlocked and more and more strikes and threats of strikes became inevitable. The long and economically harmful steel strike of 1959 was the result of the union's stubborn challenge of management's right to manage, matched for 155 days by the steel companies' equally stubborn resistance to that painful challenge. The present railroad crisis is one of essentially similar character.

The emergency, whatever may be its stopgap resolutions, is one of utmost seriousness. The Nation can ill afford an extended rail strike. Neither labor nor management can afford a lengthy work stoppage. In an area as sensitive as general transportation the public interest is closely and deeply involved. The national safety might well be jeopardized. Because of these considerations, it is reasonable to suppose that one strong measure or another would be restored to by the Federal Government, should other measures fail and should railroad operations cease and begin to stagnate. But no strong measures are possible that would not at the same time deal a devastating blow to the very institution of free collective bargaining. Compulsory arbitration, no matter the guise under which it may be presented, strikes at the very heart of free unionism. Just as government seizure of property and industrial operations strikes at the heart of free enterprise. And free unionism and free enterprise together constitute indispensable supports of our American free society.

Both labor and management, however aware they may be of these simple, basic facts, appear to be compelling each other to ignore them if only because of their fruitless endeavor to resolve nonnegotiable issues by means of collective bargaining.

The truest and deepest crisis—as both sides must agree—is thus one that must treat the work rules issue per se as merely incidental. The crisis that really hurts is built into the very vitals of free collective bargaining as an approach to cooperative effort and the economic necessity of labor-management partnership. It is the bargaining table itself that may be faced with collapse and with being swept away along with the economic debris resulting from a widespread, long-drawn-out rail strike. And simply because, as an institution, collective bargaining has been allowed to spread from an orderly domain into a jungle of wild, unruly, supergrowth—because no judicious limits were placed upon its offices in the first place and because it therefore expanded well beyond its national province until it got completely out of hand.

Looking at the picture without partisan emotion and with nothing but the required amount of everyday commonsense, I am convinced that the time has unquestionably arrived to determine what in the very nature of labor-management relations properly belongs to labor, what properly belongs to management, and what properly belongs to their partnership in production. Needed is a responsible survey to determine and establish just what conditions of employment are negotiable and what conditions of employment are not—and never can be—legitimately negotiable. Only when such a basic survey has been made can the creative offices of collective bargaining be truly and fully realized and overall economic justice be achieved on the industrial scene.

Should such a survey be made and should the domain of collective bargaining be fairly and intelligibly established by statute, we may be sure that the threat of calamitous strikes over work rules in the transportation industry and elsewhere in the Nation's economy would be far less likely to arise. For neither management's right to manage or the union's right to be and to operate as a full-fledged and independent organization of labor would be challenged by the party of the other part or by any public opponent. No management would be permitted to invade the organization or in any way determine the operations of the union bargaining agent; and no union negotiators would be permitted to invade the employer's organization with a schedule of demands which, if acceded to, would rob that organization of the very efficiency required for it to survive the competition that is a part of its very environment—and which by this circumstance would be tantamount to surrendering its managerial right to manage and handing it over the union.

The fact that this underlying issue is built into the present work rules crisis should not be overlooked by any observer—and certainly it should not be overlooked by the Congress of the United States. The very least we have a right to expect of our Senators and Congressmen, if together they are to respond to the challenge now tossed in their laps—and respond with the long-term vision the situation most truly invites—is that the authentic function of free collective bargaining shall be understood and that its areas shall be effectively defined so as to wall out perversion of that rightful function and prevent a jungle land of misconception from taking over.

The difficulty that has led to the present crisis in the railroad industry—and that will lead to many more such crises within the American economy—is that productive efficiency is primarily a management prob-

lem, whose solution is inseparable from managerial prerogative and is therefore not negotiable with any union. Which means that the imposition of work rules devised to save an industry from economic decay and prostration does not fall within the authentic domain of free collective bargaining.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS.

DEATH OF OMAR B. KETCHUM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to express my tribute to a great American whose obituary appears in Friday's Washington Evening Star and whose contributions to our American way of life have long been admired and applauded by millions of Americans, especially by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which organization he served so faithfully and fruitfully for so many years. I refer of course to the sad passing of Omar B. Ketchum, the beloved and effective head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars office here in Washington.

Omar Ketchum was an American leader whose courage matched his convictions and who could always be counted upon to battle valiantly for any patriotic purpose or any pro-American cause. He and the VFW organization which he served so ably were in the vanguard of every fight to protect our great Republic against the subversive forces of communism and to promote the strong national defenses of our country. His leadership in these trying times will be sorely missed.

Under unanimous consent of the Senate I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the full text of the obituary from the Washington Evening Star.

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

OMAR B. KETCHUM, 65, HEAD OF WASHINGTON VFW OFFICE

Omar B. Ketchum, 65, head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Office in Washington for more than 20 years, died yesterday at Suburban Hospital after a long illness.

A veteran of World War I, Mr. Ketchum became commander of the Philip Dillard Post No. 1650 at Topeka in the 1930's and served as national chief of staff from 1939 to 1940. He then served as national organization director of membership.

In 1941 Mr. Ketchum was appointed national legislative director and then to his latest position, which includes supervision of all functions of the Washington VFW office.

A strong believer in citizens' participation in government, he often urged veterans to become active Americans.

"Join a veterans' association. Get into politics. Be active Americans. Then you can complain," he once said.

Following his own advice, he tried politics himself in the 1930's. From 1931 to 1935 he was mayor of Topeka, Kans., and in 1934 he was the Democratic nominee for Governor of Kansas, losing to Alfred M. Landon.

In 1936 he ran on the Democratic slate for the U.S. Senate against Arthur Capper, losing by a narrow margin.

A native of Hardy, Ark., Mr. Ketchum was educated in Kansas schools. He served four terms as president of the Topeka Typographical Union.

He leaves his wife, Edna G., of 5905 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, the home address; five children, Ronald, of 2939 Bryan Street, Alexandria; Arlene, of the home address; Thomas, of Topeka; William, of Coffeyville, Kans., and Mrs. James Rexroat, of Kansas City, Kans.

Another son, Jack B., an Air Force pilot, was killed in Europe during World War II.

Also surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Jane Ulrich, of Topeka, and Mrs. Alta Maggard, of Arvada, Colo.

TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ithaca, N.Y., relating to taxation of municipal securities.

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

RESOLUTION—

RESOLUTION ON TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL SECURITIES

Whereas State and municipal securities have historically received immunity from taxation by the Federal Government; and

Whereas Federal securities and property have historically received immunity from taxation by State and local governments; and

Whereas the exemption from Federal taxation of interest on securities of State and local governments is threatened by the U.S. Treasury Department in its interpretation of the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959, Public Law 86-69; and

Whereas the tax of States and municipalities will be made immeasurably more difficult if they cannot borrow on reasonably favorable terms in the private market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Common Council of the City of Ithaca, N.Y., does urge the Congress to enact legislation which would leave no doubt as to the tax exempt treatment of State and local bond interest; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is authorized and directed to address certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING, Senators from the State of New York and the Honorable HOWARD ROBISON, Congressman from this congressional district.

FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the recent dedication of a new housing development in New York City, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman delivered an address which should, in my view, be brought to the attention of my colleagues. The cardinal's statement is particularly notable because it emphasizes the positive aspect of what is happening in our Nation today in the drive for equal rights for all. While in no way denying how much is left to be done, Cardinal Spellman quite properly specifies exactly how integration actually works in New York in particular situations. His statement is also valuable because it stresses the important role which the church plays in this most vital movement toward making our constitutional guarantees a reality.

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

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

ADDRESS BY CARDINAL SPELLMAN AT DEDICATION OF CORNELIUS J. DREW HOUSES, JULY 11, 1963

The dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses is an extremely happy and gratifying occasion for me. Naturally I am always pleased when a priest of this archdiocese is honored, but I am especially pleased today, because Monsignor Drew was one of our truly great priests. Selfless and dedicated, the last thing he ever wanted during his lifetime was honor for himself. But the memory of such a man deserves to be enshrined, and I can think of no more fitting way to perpetuate the memory of Monsignor Drew than by giving his name to this magnificent housing project, built for the people he so loved, and whom he served with such devotion.

Monsignor Drew was a practical priest. His eyes were fixed on heaven but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs. He not only brought the glad tidings of the Gospel to those he served; he also labored that they might have a fair measure of the material things of life, without which it is difficult to respond to the demands of the spirit. A starving child finds it hard to pray. A family in a cramped, unsanitary tenement is scarcely able to function as a family—to stay together and to pray together in the way a family should. Monsignor Drew saw this clearly, and he brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education, and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor.

This new development, therefore, is dedicated to the memory of a priest whom I knew well and admired as a dedicated public and religious servant. When he had finished a brilliant career as a missionary on the New York Apostolate, at a time when he could well have asked for a light assignment, he came and asked me to give him the honor of succeeding Msgr. William McCann as pastor of this parish of St. Charles. He knew, he said, that he could not hope to continue the great work of this devoted apostle, but he would do his best. This dedication today is a testimony to the success of his ministry here. In recent years when Monsignor Drew's strength began to fail I went to him and offered him an assignment which would be less demanding on his physical energies. His answer was characteristic—"Allow me," he said, "to die as I have lived—among my friends and neighbors in Harlem."

I know that Monsignor Drew would not want his name to be used on these buildings today unless it were clearly understood that it stands as a symbol for the devoted and dedicated priests, brothers, sisters and laity who for more than 50 years have cherished the privilege to live, to work, and to die among their friends and neighbors in Harlem.

Happily there is a growing awareness in our country of these basic needs of people. This housing project is one evidence of that awareness. The Cornelius J. Drew Houses are a tribute to the public housing programs of our city and State. Public housing under the Federal, State, and city programs, helps fill the need for decent dwellings for many of our fellow Americans of all races, creeds, and colors, and, therefore, deserves the approval and the encouragement of all our citizens. New legislation embodying a creative approach to the problems of public housing and bringing new and imaginative solutions may be helpful to perfect the programs so well under way.

When we speak of all races, creeds, and colors we touch upon something which is on everyone's mind today, and about which

it is impossible to remain silent on such an occasion as this—and that is the crying need for full justice and equality for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. The inequities inflicted upon them have been a festering problem in our society for many decades. There is simply no reason—there never was and there never can be—why the color of a man's skin should limit his opportunities in a society that boasts of freedom.

The Negro is asked to give as much as any other man for his country. He has a right to receive back from his country in equal measure. On my trips over many years to visit our soldier-sons all over the world, I have seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war. Yet contrary to every Christian principle and in downright defiance of the glorious American ideal of equal justice for all, some of those same Americans who risked their lives for America—for you and for me—are denied the right to vote, the right to receive an adequate education, the right to live where they desire and their means enable them to live and to receive the normal courtesies befitting their dignity as human beings.

They are denied these rights for only one reason—the color of their skin. How lamentable that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together. This is an outrage which America cannot tolerate. Doors cannot continue to close in the faces of Negroes as they search for jobs, as they strive for membership in some unions, as they seek the chance for specialized job training. Surely the spirit of justice and equality which lives in the very heart of our great Nation will not permit these inequities to continue.

People today are restless and impatient with the painfully slow progress that has been made in solving this problem of racism. The tradition of America is to get things done promptly and efficiently. Her tradition is also to get them done peacefully. In other lands, and unfortunately also in our own, violence has often been the companion of change. That is not the right way in America. That is not the American way. We must accomplish what has to be done working together, as one people with a common ideal, working calmly but with determination to progress and to succeed in making our ideals a reality.

These ideals could be effectively realized if all Americans regardless of religion would drop the barriers of discrimination, if employers would hire qualified Negroes—and provide training opportunities so that more Negroes may become qualified, and freely admit Negroes to unions and to apprenticeship programs.

In the field of housing, the excellent laws against discrimination in New York City and New York State must be supplemented by the active interest and vigilant efforts of all our citizens. Different races can live side by side harmoniously. While emphasis is placed on trouble spots, we can point to many areas where integrated living goes on as it should. One such is the area in the northeast Bronx where both the Parish of Our Lady of Grace and the neighborhood as a whole has taken the initiative to demonstrate that people of different races and colors can live together in mutual respect, go to school together, worship together, and be full American citizens enjoying the blessings of democracy in action.

Pope John XXIII—in that wonderful manner of his, distinguished by faith, love and warm friendliness—made a declaration on this very point. In his encyclical, "Peace on Earth", he states: "even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic qualities, they all possess certain essential common elements and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty, therefore, to live in communion with one another."

In this immediate neighborhood stands the Lieutenant Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Community Center. Established in May, 1954, this community center serves over 2,000 individuals in 34 different activities. There everyone who desires or needs its services is welcome. Such has been the consistent policy of our archdiocesan institutions in the 156 years of the history of the archdiocese of New York, for this is Catholic faith—catholicism and Americanism in action.

In the field of education, we seek schools that are honestly integrated. I am proud that our parochial schools, high schools, colleges and universities are open and have been open through the years to boys and girls of every color. Our own new 16 classroom parochial school of St. Charles Borromeo, soon to open, is an evidence of how educational opportunity is being expanded to give solid instruction to all the children. The Catholic people gladly make this contribution to the community and to our beloved country. Better education is necessary, and we are ever seeking to improve the minds and hearts of all our children, and Catholic people make tremendous sacrifices to build our schools and to maintain them. This we could not possibly do if it were not for the heroically generous contribution of their very lives by the sisters and brothers who teach in our Catholic schools. And when this new St. Charles Parochial School opens its doors, it is my intention that it bear the honored name of Msgr. Cornelius Drew.

The American Catholic bishops declared in 1958 that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man." Only last week when President Kennedy visited our new holy father, Pope Paul VI, His Holiness said, "We are ever mindful in our prayers of your efforts to insure all your citizens the equal benefits of citizenship which have as their foundation the equality of all men because of their dignity as persons and children of God."

I had the opportunity in 1949 of sending my congratulations and good wishes to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 40th anniversary, of which I have the honor of being a life member. I said then, and now I repeat: "The Catholic Church repudiates as abhorrent to her very nature the pernicious doctrine that men are born with the stamp upon them of essential racial superiority or inferiority. She recognizes no master race, but proclaims the God-given equality before God of all souls, for whose salvation our Blessed Redeemer suffered and sacrificed."

Our own Catholic Interracial Council has done much to turn the attention of people to the problems of racial injustice. Many of our parishes have conducted workshops and study programs in an effort to further integrated living and equal educational opportunity for all and to end discrimination in employment and in union membership.

But much—ever so much—remains to be done. The great Christian and American principle of equality must be reduced to action in local circumstances and in specific ways. We need civil rights measures enacted into law; but we also need the attitudes of justice and charity to be applied by every person in our society to the concrete problems of housing, employment and education. This is the challenge which 1963 has set squarely before us and it must at all costs be faced and solved.

Our Negro brother wants more than a house in America. He wants a home in America. He wishes to feel at home here. He belongs fully to America and he wants to feel fully accepted here. Until his desires are fulfilled none of us can be assured of the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

America has met her problems in the past, and has met them successfully and without turmoil. We must believe that she will meet this problem and that it too will be successfully resolved.

May we, through our cooperative efforts and our humble prayers, beseech Almighty God, the Creator and the loving Father of all peoples and all races, to hasten the day when in our beloved land liberty and justice will prevail for all men.

THE FRIGHT PEDDLER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, last week the distinguished minority whip expanded his views on a menace familiar to all of us, the fright peddler, in an article in the New York Times Sunday magazine.

The senior Senator from California also set forth a precise battle plan to combat the professional purveyors of scares and hoaxes for money and madness. In the concluding paragraphs of the article, he wrote:

I think that both of our political parties must take the fright peddlers on frontally, especially at the community level. They must be met head on by every reasonable, self-respecting American. We, each single individual among us, Republican, Democrat, or independent, have a solemn duty to speak out vigorously against those who sow hate and fear among our people and against our institutions. For the fantastic charges of the fright peddlers fall apart when held up to the light of fact and reason.

As with the Communists, the fright peddlers themselves cannot be converted by reason. But those upon whom they attempt to prey can be armed with the truth to combat them. The overwhelming majority of Americans in the middle eternally reject communism. I am confident that if they are given all the facts the same majority will ultimately repudiate the fright peddlers, their works and their fellow travelers.

For this reason and in this spirit, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

"A PLOT TO OVERTHROW AMERICA"—A CAMPAIGN OF HYSTERIA IS BEING WAGED BY SELF-STYLED PATRIOTS WHO PEDDLE FEAR—HERE A SENATOR EXAMINES SOME FRIGHT MAIL HE HAS RECEIVED, AND ASSAYS ITS EFFECT

(By THOMAS H. KUCHEL)

WASHINGTON.—Of the 60,000 or so letters I receive each month, usually about 10 percent are what I call fright mail. They are written to inform me of what the writers consider "the latest plot to overthrow America."

The information is unfailingly coupled with a prayerful or furious or hysterical demand that I do something about it immediately—or else.

Some of the more memorable plots that come to mind include these: 35,000 Communist Chinese troops, bearing arms and wearing deceptively dyed powder-blue uniforms, are poised on the Mexican border, about to invade San Diego; the United States has turned over—or will at any moment—its Army, Navy, and Air Force to the command of a Russian colonel in the United Nations; almost every well-known American or free

world leader is, in reality, a top Communist agent; a U.S. Army guerrilla-warfare exercise in Georgia, called Water Moccasin III, is in actuality a United Nations operation preparatory to taking over our country.

All these tales, of course, would be amusing rather than tragic, were it not for the fact that thousands of Californians—and heaven knows how many other Americans—swallow them whole and generally resist any efforts to refute them. Every public official I have ever talked to on the subject confirms receiving an unhealthy share of mail from people taken in by such claptrap. Being from the most populous State, I can no doubt lay claim to the dubious distinction of receiving as much as or more than any of my Senate colleagues. But Senators from much smaller States have told me that sometimes up to 30 percent of their mail fits into the fright category.

The hoaxes are most often the handiwork of what I have called "fright peddlers"—hundreds of self-styled "patriotic" individuals or groups that, I firmly believe, are doing America much harm. Just who are the fright peddlers?

In many cases, they appear to be a scattered few poor souls with a mimeograph machine, a chauvinistic title, some star-spangled paper and a limited mailing list. In others, they appear to be well-financed organizations with printing presses, "research staffs" and solid subscription lists.

Some, of course, are simply the old standby commercial bigots who have found rejuvenation and greater acceptance with the Supreme Court's striking down of segregation. Others seem to be amateur newcomers, attempting to achieve rank and perhaps ultimately to turn "pro"—and get incorporated. For this may be the gateway to radio and television programs, personal tours and lots of speechmaking to compatible groups, which is a long way from merely drumming up organized letters-to-the-editor campaigns.

In any event, the fright peddler is the self-appointed savior of our land who finds conspiracy, treason and "sellout" in almost every act or pronouncement of government or government official here, there and everywhere, and puts forth his findings with astonishing fecundity.

The Water Moccasin hoax, which was intertwined with the aging but ever-popular "Russian colonel" scare, makes perhaps the most fascinating and instructive case study of the work of the fright peddlers.

Water Moccasin III, last March, was one in a continuing series of field exercises conducted by the Army's Special Warfare Center at Fort Stewart, Ga., to provide realistic training for guerrilla and counterguerrilla warfare, such as is now going on in South Vietnam against the Communist Vietcong. It involved 600 officers and men, including 124 officers from 17 foreign countries of the free world; 4 of these were Africans from Liberia.

The first Water Moccasin fright letters arrived in my office in late February and early March. Accompanying several of them were printed copies of a letter purportedly written by one P. A. Del Valle, president of something called the Defenders of the American Constitution, and national defense chairman of something else called the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. The letter said, in part:

"The undersigned is convinced this [Water Moccasin] * * * signified rehearsals of the U.N. takeover of the U.S.A. under the Disarmament Treaty [sic] promulgated under Public Law No. 87-297 * * * The urgency of this message is obvious. This appears to be the beginning of a crash program to disarm the U.S.A. and make us a province of the U.N. May God in His mercy help us prevent this catastrophe."

Shortly afterward, it appears, a Congressman got into the act with a newsletter describing Water Moccasin as "fantastic" and "frightening." "It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under article 43 of the United Nations Charter," he wrote darkly. (Article 43, which has never been invoked, deals with a permanent international peace force.) His newsletter was reprinted and circulated, probably throughout the entire country, by something called the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers. Reprints sold for 2 cents apiece or 100 for $1.75.

About this time, I began hearing from terrified constituents that one Theodore Jackman, of Greenville, S. C., had made talks in California about the "frightening military maneuver," operation Water Moccasin. On a hunch, I checked some John Birch literature I always keep near at hand and, sure enough, Rev. Theodore Jackman is listed as an available orator of the American Speakers Bureau, operated by the John Birch Society, whose major contributions to the welfare and security of the United States to date have been to "unmask" Dwight Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles as traitors.

Some apostles of fear on radio and TV apparently were also now running amuck with the story. Before long I had received several thousand letters from swindled souls writing, and writhing, in hysteria. The following are just a few sample excerpts:

"Frightening * * *. It is time Congress demands the facts about exercise Water Moccasin II, the United Nations war operations and NATO operations."

"There are African Negro troops, who are cannables [sic], stationed in Georgia."

"How come these pagan, ruthless, brutal, Godless savages? Yes we know of the U.N. plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops over our dear United States (the same kind of troops which ravaged Katanga)."

"I have a report at this time that there are 15,000 United Nations personnel from 15 countries participating. Sixteen thousand African soldiers * * * complete with nose and earrings."

This, then, is just a small illustration of the use some fright peddlers made of a legitimate and, I think, valuable U.S. Army exercise. And I am still receiving hundreds of letters about Water Moccasin.

Through them runs the persistent theme that the United Nations, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and even NATO were behind the "sinister plot." For these institutions—not to mention the income tax—are all key targets for demolition of almost all of the "I am a better American than you are" outfits.

Many of the Water Moccasin letters—plus thousands of other fright letters over the years—tell me that the goal of most of the plots is to turn over our military to the command of a "Russian colonel" in the U.N.

In recent months, my constituents have sent me letters as well as leaflets and clippings by the thousands from, for example, the U.S. Flag Committee of Jackson Heights, N.Y., the United Societies of Methodist Layman of Austin, Tex., the Cross and the Flag run by Gerald L. K. Smith, and a California newspaper reporting a speech by a Birch Society organizer, former Congressman John Rousselot—all telling me again the old story, familiar to hundreds of beleaguered legislators, that the Russian colonel (sometimes "promoted" to general) is, in effect, "military chief" of the United Nations.

The man they refer to is the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs. The post is customarily filled by a Russian member of the Secretariat, currently Vladimir P. Suslov, one of a number of U.N. officials with Under Secretary rank. But not only does no Russian "command" any U.N. forces, the Russians have consistently refused to vote for or help pay for U.N. military operations.

The originator of this package of fright is one Myron Fagan, director of something called the Cinema Educational Guild in Hollywood. He first told the story of the Russian colonel who was military chief of the United Nations in, of all things, a play he wrote in the 1950's.

Mr. Fagan is well known to many legislators as the industrious author of many tracts and booklets. He was also well known to the California State Senate Fact Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities of the 1961 regular California Legislature, which reported: "We do not wish to impugn the sincerity of Mr. Fagan, but we do wish to make public the facts about his Cinema Educational Guild, and our opinion concerning the erroneous nature of many of the statements contained in its publications. * * * There are many evidences of anti-Semitism throughout many of the booklets and in many of the Fagan speeches."

The fright peddlers are, I believe, a serious danger to the country. Their slogans—get the United States out of the U.N. stop all foreign aid; repeal the income tax; abolish NATO—constitute a program that could hardly delight Nikita Khrushchev more. I honestly believe that if he could—and maybe he can—underwrite the cost of these un-American goals, he would eagerly do so.

At the very least, by huckstering half-truths and downright falsehoods, the fright peddlers scare the daylights out of many Americans and divert our attention from the real menace to our freedom and our way of life. They sow suspicion and hatred. They attempt to undermine faith in our Government, its institutions and officials. In my opinion, they degrade America and Americans and do it as well as or better than the Communists. And they defile the honorable philosophy of conservatism as thoroughly as the Communists defile the honorable philosophy of liberalism.

I am also concerned because the followers of the fright peddlers have shown for the most part either ignorance or indifference regarding the anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, and racism that often are underlying themes of fright literature.

Since I spoke on the Senate floor on May 2 against the fright peddlers I have received hundreds of letters, some on fine quality stationery, reeking with bigotry and hate.

I believe these manifestations represent a latent danger. A number of constituents lately arrived from Europe have, indeed, written me to note a parallel between the activities of some of the "frightists" and the activities of some of those who first wore swastikas around their arms in the 1920's.

Another disturbing aspect of the fright peddlers' worth is that their power reaches down into local affairs—municipal elections, school board contests, public library operations. For the person who sees a Communist conspiracy in the White House or the Congress or the U.S. Army is likely to see the same conspiracy in a fluoridation vote or a schoolbook or a Steinbeck novel.

There are, naturally, peddlers of fright and deceit on the extreme left, also. And they stimulate letters hysterically and furiously demanding peace at any price, unilateral disarmament, love and kisses for Castro, et al. But they account for less than 1 percent of the fright mail I receive.

Why have the fright peddlers of the far, far right found such a great response in the United States?

Some analysts attribute their success to a sort of cold-war battle fatigue. They may be correct. Many of the victims of the fright peddlers seek and see only simple causes and simple solutions to complex problems of long standing.

There is evidence, moreover, that fright-seeking, like horror movies, can be fun for some. A few Birchers have written to me that their gatherings have provided them

with some of the nicest social evenings and best refreshments they have ever had.

I do not doubt that many of the victims believe sincerely that they are striking a blow for freedom against communism. That delusion makes me only more concerned. For as J. Edgar Hoover wrote in the Journal of the American Bar Association in February 1962: "Today, far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America, giving erroneous information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism but this information must be factual, accurate, and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies."

On the brighter side, since my speech of May 2, 4 out of every 5 of the more than 15,000 persons who have written to me about the fright peddlers have written to support my position. What can they, and the rest of us, do about this insidious campaign?

I think that both of our political parties must take the fright peddlers on frontally, especially at the community level. They must be met head on by every reasonable, self-respecting American. We, each single individual among us, Republican, Democrat, or independent, have a solemn duty to speak out vigorously against those who sow hate and fear among our people and against our institutions. For the fantastic charges of the fright peddlers fall apart when held up to the light of fact and reason.

As with the Communists, the fright peddlers themselves cannot be converted by reason. But those upon whom they attempt to prey can be armed with the truth to combat them. The overwhelming majority of Americans in the middle eternally reject communism. I am confident that if they are given all the facts the same majority will ultimately repudiate the fright peddlers, their works, and their fellow travelers.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am proud to announce that the National Education Association has announced its support for the cold war GI bill. This great national organization is composed of more than 860,000 educators and administrators from the elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, junior colleges, colleges, universities and educational agencies across this country. The members of this association, all of whom have dedicated their lives to the education of the youth of this land, are familiar with the financial difficulties which face the cold war veteran in continuing his education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time the letter of July 17, 1963, from Mr. John M. Lumley, the director of the division of Federal relations of the National Education Association, pledging their active working support of the cold war GI bill. This letter is the latest evidence of the continuing and ever growing support which is being expressed for the cold war GI bill by the educators of this country, and an indication of the ground swell of public opinion which is rallying for the passage of S. 5. The Nation needs this bill; nobody realizes that better than the educators who spend their lives for the education of youth.

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

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: we are pleased to learn that S. 5 has been approved by the committee and will now receive consideration.

The National Education Association will continue to do everything possible to secure favorable action in this session. However, we know that it is through your untiring efforts that the bill has been approved.

Congratulations on a job well done.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director, Division of Federal Relations.

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

STOCKPILING STUDY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, our stockpiling program is much in the news these days and is a matter of great public and congressional interest. I cannot but feel that the picture has been somewhat distorted, both by the public and in Congress.

The Armed Forces Chemical Journal for June 1963 has published a well-thought-out, sane appraisal of our stockpiling program, giving the history of its inception and pointing out its essentiality. This study was written by a man highly competent to do so. The author is Robert Redwine, known to me for many years when he was chief of the Associated Press Bureau for Arizona, and more recently as the professional staff expert for minerals for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a committee on which I now have the honor to serve.

Mr. President, in view of the timeliness of Mr. Redwine's study in relation to an immediate, pressing public problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STOCKPILE—OR PERISH

(By Robert W. Redwine)

"Stockpile: A reserve supply of raw materials or goods * * * not yet being used."—Webster's 20th Century Dictionary unabridged.

There is nothing basically new about the general idea of stockpiling—that is the methodical storing up of goods in times of plenty and tranquillity against the days of evil that are bound to reoccur if the lessons of history are to be relied upon.

Not only man, but certain creatures of the animal world engage in stockpiling, notably the bees, the ants, and the squirrels.

In the Book of Genesis it it recorded that Joseph was appointed Pharaoh's stockpile administrator, and that he gathered up and stored all the surplus food during 7 years of plenty in the land of Egypt, and then "opened all the storehouses" and sold off the stockpile when famine came and stalked all the then known world.

Today, as Uncle Sam's so-called national stockpile and its future is weighed in the balance, discussed and "cussed," there are those who profess to see in the Biblical account of early day stockpiling both an economic and military lesson that should be heeded as America faces the troubled days ahead. Their plea is don't open the storehouses except in times of extreme emergency. Others, just as sincere, say it's too big and we need all we can get by selling off the surplus to help balance the budget.

The average citizen is left confused and befuddled by the controversy sparked and fanned by the congressional hearings just ended. He or she does not comprehend that the national stockpile, composed mainly of minerals, but also having in it such diverse items as feathers and down, iodine, diamonds, sperm oil, silk, and opium, is only one of many Government stockpiles.

The supplemental stockpile, the Commodity Credit Corporation barter pipeline, the Defense Production Act inventory, all orphaned half-brothers of the national stockpile, and the well-publicized reserve supply of surplus agricultural products have a total book value slightly in excess of the value of all of Uncle Sam's gold stored in the caves of Fort Knox.

But this is not all by a wide margin. Recently it was revealed that the Department of Defense has on hand some $8 billion worth of items "in long supply," such as stocks of weapons and ammunition built up during World War II and the Korean conflict and "still considered handy to have just in case."

Another stockpile of major proportions is the reserve merchant marine fleet, made up largely of the Liberty ships built during World War II. These 1,830 vessels, swinging at anchor, side by side in ghostly parade, cost $6,200,000 annually to maintain. Yes, there is a continuous maintenance cost because barnacles form on the hull of an idle ship just as they do on one in active service or on one used as a storage bin for surplus grain, the sad fate of scores of these patriarchs of the sea now in moth balls.

To construct these Liberty ships and the few remaining lumbering old freighters of World War I held in the moth ball reserve fleet the American taxpayer paid some $7,464,371,140.

At this point it might be well to give the cost of acquisition for the other stockpiles heretofore mentioned. All figures are for as of February 28, 1963. National stockpile, $5,870,072,100; Defense Production Act, $1,500,308,600; supplemental-barter, $1,312,701,632; surplus agricultural commodities (food reserve, $5,031,575,805.

Then, in addition, there are the little items of civil defense supplies and equipment: $215,708,551, and machine tools: $94,790,200.

In the current controversy over stockpiling the general tendency, for some peculiar reason, has been to ignore all stockpiles except the mineral reserves listed in the national, DPA, and supplemental stockpiles. The hue and cry has been directed toward proposals for disposal of large segments of mineral stocks on hand.

Many individuals, both within and without the mineral industries, including some leading economists and fiscal experts, are fearful of any plan that calls for substantial disposals from the mineral stockpile. They recognize the importance of the mineral extractive industry in the economy of the Nation, indeed in the worldwide economy of the age in which we live, civilization built upon the widest use of metals and chemicals in the history of the world.

They cite dangers inherent in disrupting historic trade and price patterns by selling from reserves rather than from current production except, and only except, in times of short supply during an emergency such as warfare.

Such experts are prepared to and do cite examples to show and prove the validity of

their fears that unbridled disposal of these minerals in stock, as is being proposed in some quarters, could easily result in economic chaos at home and violent complications in international affairs.

It is even logically being envisioned that the national budget would be bruised and lacerated far more than soothed by any attempt to convert a large part of the stockpile into dollars. Such disposal inevitably would result in a considerable slowdown in raw material production patterns with an accompanying reduction of employment in the country's mines. This reduction in employment would be quickly followed by an increase in demands upon unemployment insurance and welfare funds and by a reduction in the taxpaying capabilities of a large number of workers, and their employers. All levels of government, local, State, and Federal, would be adversely affected.

Many informed military-minded experts see substantial sales from reserves, if permitted by the Congress, weakening national security by forcing the closing down and ultimate destruction for all practical purposes, of numerous domestic mining operations thus increasing the Nation's dangerous dependence upon foreign sources for many strategic and critical minerals. This latter crime, it is averred, would be compounded by the inevitable contribution it would make to the imbalance in our import-export trade and the draining away of our gold reserves.

Advocates of "no sales of critical and strategic minerals from the stockpile," including the American Mining Congress whose technical committees have probably studied the problem as thoroughly as any group, point out that during World War II Nazi submarines sent to the bottom of the ocean 6,402 merchant ships, many of them carrying vitally needed mica, manganese, copper and tungsten from foreign lands to the United States.

The Allied sealanes shipping position became so critical at one time that bombers were diverted from the front to serve as cargo planes to bring in critical minerals demanded by this Nation's all-out war effort.

America's continuing dependence upon foreign ores, in varying degrees as to mineral but in almost every category, and particularly during war when the demand increases many-fold, makes it imperative, if national security is to be served maximally, that the national stockpile of minerals be maintained at its present level.

On the other hand, the same considerations seem to call for a technical review of the mineral stockpile to the end that a judgment be made to convert several items in it into more readily usable forms best suitable for stockpiling and storage techniques.

Woven into the fabric of the organic statutes providing for the procurement and maintenance of the strategic and critical minerals stockpile is congressional mandated authority to upgrade, beneficiate and refine, "through normal commercial channels," individual items making up the various stockpiles.

Congress, in granting this authority, unquestionably was motivated by recognition of the fact that the best national interests would be served by having stored materials in a readily usable form best suitable for stockpiling; and further, that inherent in such proscribed beneficiation or refinement also would be the stockpiling of electric power, manpower, and plant facility utilization, all of which very likely would be in short supply in time of national emergency.

In Congress and elsewhere whenever the question of a substantial upgrading program arises the problem of how it is to be financed looms up large and loud with the seemingly inevitable effect of killing the subject temporarily. Fatal flaws are found in the suggestion that processors or refiners might be compensated by payments-in-kind, including the obvious one that it would result in market glutting.

In consideration of any suggestion that desirable upgrading be financed by cash payments weight must be given to the present status of the budget and a judgment be made as to which things come first in Government programing.

And yet it cannot be denied: (1) the national interest and security would be served by refining several items in the stockpile; (2) an upgrading program would stimulate employment and generally strengthen the economy; (3) the end result from an upgrading program would be a material increase in the dollar value of the stockpile without any increase in the totality of holdings, a very desirable plus; (4) raw materials, which in some instances are now wasting assets through exposure to wind and rain erosion, would be converted into readily storable and nonwasting form.

The four benefits listed above, and others, could easily be achieved by adoption of a program whereby processors or refiners would be compensated for their services through payment in surplus agricultural commodities which do not store well and which, international traders aver, can be absorbed in certain foreign areas without disturbance of dollar sales patterns.

It would seem needless to expand upon the far-reaching beneficial effects this would have on the U.S. balance-of-payments trade deficit and drain on gold reserves which is of such serious concern today.

There would be still another plus to the Government of equal importance, that is the tremendous saving in financing, insurance and storage costs on the agricultural commodities involved in such a disposal plan. Current Government statistics show that these costs, for many agricultural products, in from 4 to 5 years equal or exceed the original investment.

The deterioration and storage cost ratios of minerals and metals, particularly in refined form are generally infinitesimal when compared with those of agricultural products. For example, in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 the cost of storage and maintenance of the critical and strategic stockpile items, including minerals—with a value of $8,683,082,332—was only $12,429,080 compared with a storage and maintenance cost of $391,208,665 on $5,031,575,805 worth of agricultural product reserves.

No cogent argument has ever been advanced against upgrading per se, that is limited upgrading that does not impair the flexibility and availability of a material to press the future needs of developing weapons systems and changing technologies.

Carefully thought out refining of a material would enhance the sale or use value of that portion of the stockpile far beyond the cost of processing and without increasing the totality of stockpile holdings, the latter being a must in the eyes of some people.

It would appear that a program of stockpile upgrading as herein outlined, if prosecuted with vigor, would provide a happy solution for two widely differing schools of thought. For those seeking to convert the stockpile into dollars there would be the tremendous savings in storage costs on agricultural commodities and a lift rather than an assault on the Nation's balance of trade and gold reserve positions and, in addition, a retained asset of increased value. For the other group there would be a more valuable stockpile, easier to store and more readily available for ultimate use, without any increase in the totality of holdings.

For John and Jane Public and their children the world would be a little safer place to live, because: "Stockpiles not only provide protection in the event of war; the knowledge of their existence may also be an important deterrent to the outbreak of war."—AMC.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McGOVERN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H.R. 6016, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the monetary authorizations for the following river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased as follows:" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the provisions of 201 and 202 of Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress (76 Stat. 1180), and to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this Act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *Provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission: *And provided further*, That the monetary authorizations for the river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased and additional projects authorized as follows:"; on page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

An additional sum of $2,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954.

On page 3, after line 2, to insert:

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

The project for the comprehensive development of the Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,143,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River in the interest of watershed protection and flood prevention, and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, such surveys and investigations and the report thereon to be prepared and submitted in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 639, Eighty-seventh Congress, and said surveys and investigations are hereby authorized.

After line 18, to insert:

SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA-SOUTH CAROLINA

The Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir on the Savannah River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 11, 1963, at an estimated cost of $78,700,000.

On page 4, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; after line 6 to insert:

APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, is approved and the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report at an estimated cost of $63,200,000.

In line 18, after the word "of", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000"; on page 5, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$157,000,000" and insert "$31,000,000"; after line 6, to insert:

That the modification of the existing project for the Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, in order to provide for the construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), is hereby modified to provide that the United States shall assume the full cost of constructing said facilities, at an estimated additional Federal cost of $404,000.

In line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000"; at the top of page 6, to insert:

RED RIVER BASIN

The Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 6, 1963, at an estimated cost of $25,100,000: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

After line 9, to strike out:

An additional sum of $80,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented, is further modified to include such bank protection or rectification works at or below the Garrison Reservoir as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may be found necessary, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000.

In line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$47,000,000"; on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

The project for the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

After line 9, to insert:

The proviso contained in the authorization for the project for flood control and allied purposes on Laurel River, Kentucky, authorized by Public Law 86-645, approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 496), is hereby modified to read as follows: *Provided,* That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment wthin fifty years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power.

After line 18, to strike out:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

An additional sum of $11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented.

On page 8, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$36,000,000"; after line 13, to insert:

The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided,* That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project.

The project for the Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 130, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $52,000,000.

And, on page 9, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$16,000,000".

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota further yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator yields for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

A VOLUNTARY WHEAT ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BURDICK, McCARTHY, McGEE, NELSON, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a voluntary wheat-crop adjustment and price support bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table 5 legislative days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested.

The bill (S. 1946) to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the bill would make the wheat certificate plan in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 an entirely voluntary program, to become effective with the 1964 wheat crop, by repealing the compulsory features, which were the principal target of the opposition in the wheat referendum in May. Otherwise it would make little change in the program which our Agriculture Committees considered very carefully, and the Congress enacted about a year ago.

I have submitted this proposal to agricultural analysts in the Legislative Reference Service and had it studied and discussed unofficially with experts at the Department of Agriculture. Without any exception, the experts who have been consulted have agreed that the voluntary wheat certificate plan, with the penalty provisions for overplanting wheat acreage allotments removed, would achieve very desirable results.

First. They report that it would permit farm income to go to a more favorable level than any other voluntary program which has been proposed. If the compulsory wheat certificate plan had been adopted, wheat producers in 1964 would have received 70 cents per bushel certificates on 950 million bushels of food and export wheat, enhancing their income $665 million. They could, by voluntary action, get certificates up to this full amount under the proposal now being introduced.

Second. The proposal would permit continued orderly reduction in Government stocks of wheat. The analysts believe that 70 to 80 percent of pro-

ducers, and a like amount of the total wheat crop, would be in voluntary compliance to become eligible for certificates, thereby reducing production sufficiently to allow sale of some wheat from CCC stocks.

Third. The proposal would reduce Government costs.

Fourth. The proposal would avoid any increase in the price of food since the price of wheat for food use would remain stable.

I feel very strongly that Congress should take early action to avert overproduction and a deep cut in the income of wheat farmers in 1964. Consequently, I think that this proposal, or the proposal to extend for another year or two the old voluntary acreage reduction program effective on this year's crop, or any other constructive suggestion, should have early consideration by Congress.

It is true that wheat farmers rejected a compulsory certificate plan in May by a majority of "No" votes. It is true that the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 provided an alternative in such an event: 50 percent of parity price supports for those producers of wheat who stay within their share of a national acreage allotment. This is support at about $1.25 per bushel compared to an average support of $1.81 per bushel on the 1963 crop.

It is also true that there is little demand for enactment of a new wheat program coming to Members of Congress from the country. A wheat crop is now being harvested which will bring producers prices based on food value. The effect of the May referendum will not be felt directly for another year. The effect will be evident July 1964, after another wheat harvest has started, and after it is too late to do anything about controlling the size of the crop or preventing a price break. Then farmers will find that their wheat is bringing only $1.25 per bushel or less and then the full effects of the May referendum will be felt.

In my opinion, it is our obligation, as the elected representatives of the citizens of the Nation, to be foresighted and to avoid just such serious developments, whether there is demand from the country or not. We do not postpone the military defense of our country until we are attacked and our citizens are crying for help. Neither should we delay now in taking steps to safeguard our agricultural economy against an otherwise certain disaster a year hence.

Unless something is done before winter wheat planting gets well underway in the Southern wheat-producing States in late August and September—within 60 days from now—we can expect a 1964 wheat crop of several hundred million bushels more than our needs, and an unnecessary drop in farm income of a half billion dollars or more.

The reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of the past 2 years will be ended. The strengthening of total farm income wil be reversed. Most of the gains of the past 2½ years in agriculture will be offset or lost without any benefit to consumers, or to the National Government in terms of lower agricultural program costs.

The New York Times for May 22, 1963—a day after the May referendum—quoted bakery officials to the effect that the anticipated decline in wheat price would not result in a decline in bread prices. Wheat, they explained, is too small a part of the cost of a loaf of bread for the price of wheat to affect the retail price of bread. In the words of one bakery spokesman quoted by the Times:

> As long as the customer wants a fresh, wholesome loaf of bread produced by a decently paid bakery employee in an extremely competitive market, we will have to spend the money on preservative chemicals, vitamins and other additives, packaging, salaries, and other things, of which flour is the least important factor.

But if the price of wheat is dropped for a year to livestock feed value—down to $1.25 per bushel or less—an effort to get the price back up to $2 per bushel will be opposed on the ground that it will raise retail bread prices and penalize consumers.

Our real hope of maintaining wheat farm income without arousing the real or imaginary fears of consumers is to maintain a stable wheat price structure through 1964, as the voluntary wheat certificate plan would do if we act on it promptly.

Before discussing the studies of the proposed voluntary wheat certificate plan I have just offered, I would like to reiterate that I think all constructive suggestions to meet the wheat problem should be studied. If there is a more feasible proposal than the one I have suggested, I shall be most happy to support it.

President Kennedy, shortly after the wheat referendum, assured administration support of any plan which would improve farm income, reduce Government costs and permit reduction of surplus stocks. My studies indicate that the voluntary certificate plan will meet all these criteria. Perhaps there are other plans which will do so. I am concerned with meeting the problem, and averting a serious upset in 1964—not in passing any particular bill.

The House Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, headed by Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas, has started hearings and will consider various proposals. I commend the Congressman and his subcommittee for getting at the problem. I have proposed the voluntary wheat certificate plan to them, to consider along with others.

The studies of the voluntary certificate plan which is now being proposed indicate that it would have real advantages over either the existing legislation that will otherwise prevail in 1964, or over other proposed voluntary programs.

THE PROPOSED PLAN COMPARED TO EXISTING WHEAT LEGISLATION FOR 1964

If no legislation is enacted in this session of Congress and no special acreage diversion programs are put into effect for the 1964 wheat crop, production is expected to exceed domestic food and export needs by several hundred million bushels. If a special acreage diversion program is undertaken under existing administrative authority, the cost of the voluntary feed grain acreage diversion program will be increased by $200 million or more.

Taking into account the acquisition cost, and cost of storage and handling for several years, of additional feed grains, and perhaps some wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of the excess production of wheat in 1964 Government costs run even higher—as high as $500 million or more if no acreage reduction program is undertaken.

As compared with prospective Government costs for the 1964 crop of $200 to $500 million under existing legislation, a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program utilizing marketing certificates, as authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, would hold wheat producers' incomes up to 50 percent higher, permit a great reduction in total grain stocks, and hold Government costs to less than $200 million.

Government savings and increased farm income combined could run to three-quarters of a billion dollars or more.

FEED GRAINS AS WELL AS WHEAT PRODUCERS WOULD BENEFIT

The results of a voluntary wheat program based on the certificate plan in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 may be compared with anticipated results from two other voluntary programs which have been proposed.

The voluntary program authorized in S. 1617, introduced in the Senate on May 27, 1963, with Farm Bureau backing, and similar bills, would provide for wheat price supports at about livestock feeding value levels plus a massive Government financed cropland retirement program estimated to cost up to $2 billion a year. Its low support levels for both wheat and feed grains, its high cost, and the unfavorable experience with the soil bank program, make it an unattractive alternative.

The voluntary combined wheat and feed grain program authorized by H.R. 6546, introduced in the House of Representatives on May 23, 1963, by Representative QUIE and others, would provide minimum price supports at 65 percent of parity for wheat with acreage diversion payments equal to 50 percent of the value of the crop not produced. Analysts indicate that such a program might not result in sufficient wheat acreage diversion to permit an orderly reduction in Government stocks because of the low supports. The Government cost of a program of this type also would be substantially higher than the Government cost of the current voluntary feed grains program and substantially higher than the cost of continuing the current feed grains program in conjunction with a voluntary wheat certificate program under provisions of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

Unless some effective voluntary wheat adjustment program involving relatively low Government cost is developed and enacted, wheat producers will produce several hundred million bushels of wheat in 1964 which will have no other market outlet than livestock feed. This extra

wheat used for livestock feed would depress feed grain prices and, in turn, livestock prices. There is no greater threat to the income of our livestock producers than a glut of cheap surplus feed on the market.

With 75- to 80-percent participation in the voluntary wheat certificate program, the amount of wheat going into the feed market would be minimized. Additionally, money paid by processors and exporters for certificates to cover wheat produced by the noncompliers, but not earned by them, would go to the Government and could be used to finance further feed grain diversion to offset the effect of noncompliance wheat which does get into the feed markets. Noncompliers would not receive certificates or price supports.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL TO AUTHORIZE A VOLUNTARY WHEAT ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

The bill I have introduced to authorize a voluntary wheat certificate plan repeals those sections of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and prior acts on which it was built, so there will be no penalties on wheat producers for planting more wheat than the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be needed in a marketing year.

It also repeals those sections of existing legislation which provide for withholding and storage of any excess wheat which might be produced.

It makes no changes in the way the national wheat marketing quota and the farm acreage allotments of wheat would be established when the supply of wheat is excessive.

It makes no change in the way the national marketing allocation of wheat would be established.

It makes no change in the provision for small farm acreage allotments.

It makes no change in the wheat-feed grain acreage substitution provisions in the 1962 act.

It makes no change in the marketing certificate provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 except to state that individual producers must comply with the wheat acreage allotments and conservation acreage requirements established for their farm in order to receive their pro rata share of the wheat marketing certificates.

This bill, by removing the Government-imposed penalties for overplanting wheat acreage allotments, eliminate the "loss of freedom" issue which was a dominant factor in the recent referendum vote. Yet, the economic incentive for complying with wheat acreage allotment and conservation reserve requirements in order to be eligible to receive wheat marketing certificates is so great that the analysts assure us a very high proportion of the wheat producers will comply.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the outcome of the May referendum on the compulsory wheat certificate plan, we cannot ignore potentialities for improved farm income, Government savings, and reduction of stocks which this or some other program offers. It would be hard to justify making no effort to pass such legislation, even though there is little present demand for a wheat bill from the country. It would mean closing our eyes to the painful economic consequences that are presently in store for wheat farmers and our related farm producers. It would amount to turning our backs on three-fourths of a billion dollars of Government saving and increased farm income. I am sure that no one wants to ignore such potential betterment of our budget, and our national income.

Danger lies in delay; in postponing action until it is too late to deal with the 1964 crop.

I realize that some top administration officials have honest doubts about the wisdom of pushing now for new wheat legislation in the wake of the recent wheat referendum which ran so decisively against the expectations of the administration and many of us in the Congress.

I am also aware that few people believe it is possible to enact legislation this year but I have a great deal of faith that with three-fourths of a billion dollars at stake along with the welfare of agriculture, Congress can and will take necessary action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a press release prepared by my office concerning my proposal and, for the benefit of those who wish to study the bill in greater detail, a copy of the bill and three supporting memorandums prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service; also, a special newsletter on the wheat situation prepared by Prof. Francis Kutish of Iowa State University on July 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Is there objection?

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

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN introduced legislation today, Monday, for a voluntary wheat program to cover the 1964 crop.

The measure is designed to appeal both to farm producers who want to be free from Government controls and to those who are willing to reduce production in return for higher prices. MCGOVERN said the plan would offer farmers who voluntarily comply with acreage allotments a return of about $2 a bushel. Those producers who do not comply would not be penalized but would not qualify for the income supports feature of the plan.

In offering the bill to the Senate, MCGOVERN, a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, recognized that Congress has received little demand for a wheat program since the defeat of the May referendum. He also said that "top administration officials have honest doubts about the wisdom of pushing now for new wheat legislation."

The South Dakota Senator contended, however, that unless Congress acts, wheat producers will be buried in cheap surplus wheat next year that will also depress both feed grains and livestock prices.

"In my opinion, it is our obligation to be foresighted and to avoid just such serious developments, whether there is demand from the country or not," MCGOVERN said.

"We do not postpone the military defense of our country until we are attacked and our citizens are crying for help. Neither should we delay now in taking steps to safeguard our agricultural economy against an otherwise certain disaster a year hence," he said.

MCGOVERN's proposal would provide a price support of $1.25 a bushel plus a 70 cents per bushel certificate to be paid by processors to farmers complying with the program.

The Senator estimated that there would be enough voluntary compliance under his proposal to reduce wheat surpluses, cut Government storage costs and stabilize farm income.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A VOLUNTARY WHEAT ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide for a voluntary wheat adjustment and price support program, the following provisions of law relating to penalties, wheat acreage diversion payments, and the wheat marketing quota referendum are repealed or amended as follows:

(a) The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1281 et seq) is amended—

(1) By striking from the first sentence of section 334(a), section 334(b), and the last sentence of section 334(c)(1), respectively, that part beginning with a colon and the word "Provided" down to but not including the period;

(2) By striking out section 334(d);

(3) By striking out the exception at the end of the first sentence of section 334(h);

(4) By striking from section 334(i) the sentence relating to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress;

(5) By striking from section 335 the first sentence and the next to last sentence;

(6) By striking out section 336;

(7) By striking out section 338;

(8) By amending section 339(a)(1) to read as follows: "(a)(1) During any year in which marketing quotas for wheat are in effect, the producers on any farm (except a new farm receiving an allotment from the reserve for new farms) on which any crop is produced on acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat shall be ineligible to receive price support on wheat or wheat marketing certificates unless (1) the crop is designated by the Secretary as one which is not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if it is permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, or as one the production of which will not substantially impair the purpose of the requirements of this section. The acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat on the farm shall be an acreage of cropland equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor determined by dividing the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below fifty-five million acres by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment."

(9) By striking "wheat," from section 372 (a);

(10) By striking from the second sentence of section 379c(a) and "(i)" and that part which begins ", plus (ii)" down to but not including the period; and

(11) By striking out the last two sentences of section 379c(b).

(b) Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340) is repealed.

(c) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a) is amended—

(1) By striking from subsection (4) the following: "or for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers"; and

(2) By striking the last two sentences out of subsection (5).

SEC. 2. (a) Section 107(5) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "and (ii)" and inserting the following: "(ii) participates in any acreage diversion program which may be in effect for feed grains to the extent required by the Secretary, and (iii)".

(b) The first sentence of section 379c(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or in which the producer does not participate in any acreage diversion program which may be in effect for feed grains to the extent required by the Secretary."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective beginning with the 1964 crop of wheat. The voluntary adjustment and price support program provided for by this Act shall be in effect for the 1964 crop without further proclamation of marketing quotas or allotments.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, ON ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF A VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

The wheat certificate program, authorized under subtitles B and D of Public Law 87-703, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, could be changed into a voluntary program by eliminating section 332 and related language in other sections which authorizes national marketing quotas. In place of the marketing quota requirements, wheat producers, to be eligible for certificates on their pro rata share of the wheat used for food and export, might be required to comply with the wheat acreage allotment and conservation reserve requirement set for the farm by the Secretary of Agriculture. The conservation reserve requirement under such arrangements, would include the minimum acreage diversion from feed grains under the feed grain program, as well as a minimum wheat acreage diversion. Wheat producers who voluntarily complied with the wheat and feed grain diversion programs would be eligible to receive wheat marketing certificates. Wheat producers who overplanted their wheat allotments or failed to divert the minimum feed grain acreages specified would be ineligible to receive the wheat marketing certificates or price support loans. However, under a voluntary wheat certificate program no penalty would be imposed. Ineligibility for wheat certificates worth 70 cents per bushel on approximately 75 percent of a producer's marketings in recent years and ineligibility for wheat and feed grain support loans, would be sufficient penalty to assure a high degree of voluntary participation.

A wheat producer with a 200-acre wheat allotment and a 100-acre feed grain base in 1963, under a voluntary program for 1964, might have approximately the following alternatives:

Voluntary cooperation with wheat certificate and feed grain programs

160 acres wheat at 20 bushels per acre equals 3,200 bushels at $1.25 per bushel	$4,000
80 acres grain sorghum at 20 hundredweight per acre equals 1,600 hundredweight at $1.60 per hundredweight	2,560
60 acres conservation reserve (diversion payments)	820
3,000 bushels wheat certificates at $0.70 per bushel	2,100
1,600 hundredweight grain sorghum price support payment at $0.15 per hundredweight	240
Total wheat, feed grain and conservation reserve income	9,720

Voluntary cooperation with wheat certificate and feed grain programs—Continued

UNDER NONCOMPLIANCE

200 acres wheat at 20 bushels per acre equals 4,000 bushels at $1.25 per bushel	5,000
100 acres grain sorghum at 20 hundredweight per acre equals 2,000 hundredweight at $1.60 per hundredweight	3,200
Total income under noncompliance (production costs also would be higher because of cropping of 60 additional acres)	8,200

With appropriate amendments a voluntary wheat certificate plan probably could be operated at no greater cost to the Government than the mandatory program provided for in Public Law 87-703.

It could be operated in such a manner as to provide for an orderly reduction to desirable levels in Commodity Credit Corporation wheat stocks.

A voluntary wheat certificate plan based on amendments to Public Law 87-703, as outlined above, would not hold farm income quite as high as a mandatory program (at any specified support level for wheat used for food and export), but it would hold farm income substantially higher than a voluntary wheat and feed grains acreage diversion program with wheat price supports based on the feeding value of wheat.

The Government cost of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, plus the cost of the 1964-65 voluntary feed grains program, also would be less than the Government cost of a combined voluntary wheat and feed grains acreage diversion program for these and later years.

Savings in Government cost achieved by a voluntary certificate plan for wheat, as compared with a voluntary acreage diversion program results from the collection of the face value of the wheat certificate from the wheat millers and exporters.

Cooperators in a voluntary wheat certificate plan do not improve market price for noncooperators.

A voluntary wheat certificate program would not be subject to the limitations of most voluntary production adjustment programs where the noncooperators benefit from the substantial market price enhancement resulting from the production adjustments of the cooperators. Instead, through the certificate arrangement, cooperators are permitted to get premium prices for their food wheat from the market system in return for their contribution to helping adjust the production of wheat and feed grains used primarily for livestock feed. Since the market price of wheat would be related to the market price of feed grains on a feeding value and location basis, the extra wheat produced by the noncooperators would affect wheat market prices only as it affected all feed grain prices.

SOME WHEAT CERTIFICATE INCOME WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO FINANCE FEED GRAIN ACREAGE DIVERSION PROGRAM

On the basis of the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, the 1964 wheat marketing allocation for food and export would have been 950 million bushels with the wheat certificates valued at $0.70 per bushel. A marketing allocation of this amount allowed for a 150-million bushel reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. On this basis wheat producers would have received marketing certificates worth $665 million (950 × $0.70). Flour millers, wheat processors, and exporters would have purchased these as they purchased wheat for domestic food utilization or for export.

Under a voluntary plan the same marketing allocation would be made and the same requirements would apply to wheat purchased by wheat processors and exporters. All such wheat would have to be accompanied by certificates. If, however, 20 percent of the wheat producers (on a volume basis) chose not to comply, $133 million of the certificate funds collected from the wheat processors and exporters would not be paid out to the noncooperating wheat producers. These funds could be used to help finance the feed grain acreage diversion program.

Assuming producers having 10 million wheat allotment acres chose to stay out of a voluntary wheat certificate plan and over plant allotments by 30 percent, they would increase wheat plantings by 3 million acres and wheat production by 60 to 75 million bushels. The estimated $133 million collected on wheat marketing certificates, not paid out to noncooperating wheat producers and available for feed grain acreage diversion payments, would be sufficient funds to induce additional voluntary participation in the feed grain program, fully offsetting the extra wheat produced by the noncooperating wheat producers. This would be true even though only 70 or 75 percent of the wheat producers (on a wheat acreage basis) cooperated in a voluntary wheat certificate plan.

In summary a voluntary wheat certificate plan would have the same administrative problems in handling the certificates as a mandatory program. It would have the same equity problems in allocating wheat acreage allotments and in the determination of normal yields as a basis for awarding wheat marketing certificates. Difficulties associated with the administration of penalties for overplanting wheat allotments, however, would be eliminated. Producers whose allotments did not "fit" their current farming operations could grow as much wheat as they desired and sell it at market prices based on its livestock feeding value. Their only penalty for overplanting would be the denial of wheat marketing certificates and price supporting loans for both wheat and feed grains. In this respect noncomplying wheat producers would be in the same position as noncomplying feed grain producers.

The Secretary of Agriculture could provide for an orderly reduction in CCC wheat stocks when setting the annual wheat marketing allocation, by its sales policy and by a loan program for wheat (at about feed grain prices).

The cost to the Government of a voluntary wheat certificate plan would be approximately the same as for a mandatory program. The level of farm income would be slightly lower than for a mandatory program.

The level of farm income would be substantially higher, however, and the cost to the Government would be substantially lower than if wheat were added to the 1964-65 voluntary feed grains program with price supports for wheat based on its livestock feeding value.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, ON COST COMPARISONS, 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM UNDER "NO" VOTE VERSUS VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATE PLAN

If no special acreage diversion programs are put into effect for the 1964 wheat crop, production is expected to exceed domestic food and export needs by about 300 million bushels. If 200 million bushels of this additional

wheat is fed to livestock it will displace about the same amount of corn. Hence the net effect of producing 300 million extra bushels of wheat may be the addition to CCC stocks under price-support loans of:

	Millions
100 million bushels of 1964 wheat at $1.25 per bushel	$125
200 million bushels of 1964 corn at $1.07 per bushel	214
Government cost of acquisition of extra wheat and corn	339
Government cost of storage and handling for 5 years before disposal at 15 cents per bushel per year: 300 million bushels $0.75	225
Total cost to Government of producing 300 million bushels excess wheat in 1964 under "No" vote	564

Technicians have estimated that there may be higher participation and additional acreage diversion under the 1964 voluntary feed-grain program as a consequence of the defeat of the wheat referendum. If increased participation and acreage diversion in the feed-grain program reduced feed-grain production by 200 million bushels at a payment-in-kind cost equivalent to $1 per bushel (approximate cost of the 1963 program), Government costs of the wheat program in 1964 under the "No" vote would be:

	Millions
Cost of additional diversion of 200 million bushels of feed grains	$200
CCC acquisition of 100 million bushels of wheat at $1.25 per bushel	125
Government cost of storage and handling for 5 years before disposal at $0.75 per bushel	.75
Total Government cost with increased feed-grain acreage diversion	400

In contrast to estimated Government costs of $400 to $600 million for increased feed-grain acreage diversion or for acquiring and disposing of approximately 300 million bushels of excess wheat, direct Government costs of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, based on amendments to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, would not be expected to exceed $100 to $200 million.

If there was 80 percent voluntary participation, with the marketing allocation set at 950 million bushels (as announced by the Secretary prior to the referendum), producers would be eligible to receive 760 million bushels certificates having a face value of $0.70 per bushel or $532 million.

These certificates would accompany the 1964 wheat marketed by producers who were in voluntary compliance with the announced diversion and conservation reserve programs. After the certificates had passed into the hands of the first purchasers of the wheat, the Commodity Credit Corporation would stand ready to buy them at their face value of $0.70 per bushel. If CCC purchased the entire 760 million, its investment in the certificates would be $532 million. It would then offer them for sale to the domestic millers, food manufacturers, and exporters at the same face value. Domestic millers and food manufacturers would utilize about 500 million bushels of wheat and would be required to purchase an equal number of these certificates. Since the current export subsidy is about $0.60 a bushel and the certificates have a face value of $0.70 per bushel, the Government, on this basis, would receive a net of 10 cents a bushel on the certificates acquired by the exporters. The accounting for the certificates would be about as follows:

	Millions
Government cost of purchase of 760 million certificates from graintrade	$532
Less:	
Sales of 500 million certificates to domestic millers and manufacturers	350
Net from sales of 600 million certificates to exporters (face value $0.70 less $0.60 export subsidy)	60
Total received by Government	410
Government cost of voluntary certificate plan for 1964	122

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorizes acreage diversion payments on the wheat acreage diverted to comply with the 1964 wheat acreage allotments. If acreage diversion payments were made a part of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, even though made as payments in kind, they would increase the net government cost $100 to $200 million. Although acreage diversion payments would not be required for the success of a voluntary wheat certificate plan they would avoid an equivalent drop in wheat producers' incomes.

SUMMARY

A voluntary wheat certificate plan, similar to the one authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 without acreage diversion payments, would result in Government savings of $200 to $400 million as compared with the Government's obligations under existing legislation, with wheat marketing quotas for 1964 disapproved by the producers. If diversion payments were added to a voluntary wheat certificate plan, the Government cost would be no higher and might be $100 to $200 million less than under existing legislation.

A voluntary wheat certificate plan for 1964 with the wheat certificates valued at 70 cents a bushel would not increase the cost of wheat to domestic millers as compared with current prices, and would increase the net cash income of wheat producers $400 to $500 million as compared with their prospective income, since 1964 wheat marketing quotas have been disapproved. If acreage diversion payments were made a part of a voluntary wheat certificate plan, wheat producers incomes would be held $500 million or more higher than their prospective income under existing legislation or at about the level expected if marketing quotas were in effect.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Cost comparisons, existing 1964 wheat program versus voluntary certificate plan, assuming 70 percent participation

This is in response to a request for a supplement to the memorandum of June 21 on the same subject.

There are several reasons why participation in a voluntary wheat certificate plan in 1964 might be expected to be substantially higher than in the voluntary feed grain program:

1. Much wheat is produced in high-risk areas and the income insurance incentive for participating in a voluntary wheat program is greater than for a feed grains program.

2. Wheat producers who overplant their acreage allotment under existing legislation would lose history in setting future allotments. This acts as an incentive to encourage compliance with a voluntary program.

3. The income from the sale of certificates at 70 cents per bushel on the producer's share of the wheat marketing allocation is much higher in relation to the value of the crop which might be grown on the diverted acres than the combined price support and diversion payments for feed grains.

For comparative purposes, a wheat producer with a 400-acre 1963 allotment and a 25-bushels-per-acre yield might be compared with a corn producer with a 400-acre base and a 60-bushels-per-acre yield:

WHEAT FARM

400-acre 1963 allotment, 25 bushels yield.
Marketing allocation: 70 percent of normal yield.
Normal production, 10,000 bushels.
Marketing certificates, 7,000 bushels.
Diverted acres, 80.

Value of certificates	$4,900
Value of diverted production (2,000 bushels at $1.25)	2,500
Increase in gross income	2,400

FEED GRAIN FARM

400-acre base, 60 bushel yield.
Normal production, 24,000 bushels.

Price support payment: $0.15 times 19,200 bushels	2,880
Diversion payment: $0.25 times 4,800 bushels	1,200
Total payments	4,080
Value of diverted production (4,800 bushels at $1.10)	5,280
Reduction in gross income	1,200

(More than offset by reduction in production costs.)

The wheat producer, by complying, would have $2,400 higher gross income, plus some reduction in production expenses. However, his gross income would be 15 to 20 percent lower than under the 1963 program, when price supports were $1.82 per bushel.

In contrast, the corn producer might expect $1,200 less gross income by diverting 20 percent of his base acreage. This reduction in gross income would be more than offset by the reduction in production expenses. These estimates assume $1.10 per bushel, the loan rate, as the value of the corn which might have been grown on the diverted acres.

In view of these differences between the voluntary feed grains program and a voluntary wheat certificate plan, even though only 58 percent of the feed grain base acres participated in 1963, it does not appear unreasonable to expect 80 percent of the wheat allotment acres to participate in a voluntary program. (A well-informed official of a wheat organization is reported to have guessed that voluntary participation would reach 90 percent or more.)

However, if only 70 percent of the wheat acreage participated in a voluntary program and 20 percent diversion were required to be eligible for certificates, wheat seedings by cooperators would be reduced by 7.7 million acres. If wheat seedings were increased 20 percent by the nonparticipants, 3.3 million acres of the reduction would be offset. If a modest reduction in CCC wheat stocks were programed, about 100 million bushels of wheat largely produced on these extra wheat acres would be utilized as livestock feed. To this extent, a more extensive feed grain acreage diversion program would be needed. However, the certificates not allocated to the non-compliers would have a face value of $199.5 million. This saving in wheat certificate funds more than offsets the additional cost of an expanded feed grains program, as it is equivalent to $2 per bushel of wheat added to the feed grain supply.

The wheat certificate accounting with 70 percent participation, might be about as follows:

	Millions
Government cost of purchase of 665 million bushel certificates from grain trade	$465.5
Less:	
Sales of 500 million bushels to domestic millers and manufacturers	350.0
Net from sales of 600 million bu. to exporters (face value $0.70 less $0.60 export subsidy)	60.0
Total received by Government	410.0
Net cost to Government of wheat certificates	55.0
Estimated Government cost of expanded feed grain program to divert 100 million bushels additional feed grains at $1 per bushel	100.0
Direct Government cost with 70 percent participation	155.5

In summary, it appears that a voluntary wheat certificate plan would have direct Government costs of about $155 million, even though participation in it were as low as 70 percent of the wheat acres.

This compares with an estimated Government cost of perhaps $500 million under existing legislation, taking into account the acquisition cost, and cost of storage and handling for several years, of additional feed grains and perhaps some wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of the excess production of wheat in 1964. (Wheat stocks are expected to increase under existing legislation rather than decline as in recent years.)

Wheat producers incomes also would be increased by about $400 million in 1964 under a voluntary wheat certificate program with 70-percent participation as compared to the situation under existing legislation. Also, the otherwise burdensome effect of excess wheat on feed grains and livestock supplies and prices would be eased by a voluntary certificate plan.

A voluntary certificate plan would have an additional advantage. President Kennedy already has announced the delegation of emergency powers to Secretary Freeman to take such action as is necessary and is legally authorized, to prevent U.S. wheat for export from being offered for sale at less than the minimum prices specified in the International Wheat Agreement. Emergency Government management of commercial wheat exports could be avoided under a voluntary certificate plan. All wheat for export under such a program would have to be accompanied by certificates, and the Government could sell the certificates to the exporters at their face value and then grant them a subsidy as necessary to keep U.S. wheat competitive in world markets.

THE IOWA FARM OUTLOOK LETTER

(Prepared by Prof. Francis A. Kutish, of Iowa State University, July 18, 1963, Ames, Iowa)

Wheat * * *

Time is beginning to run out on the chances for new wheat legislation for the 1964 wheat crop.

Two main types of wheat proposals have been introduced into Congress: the Farm Bureau backed a proposal which would provide for wheat price supports at about livestock feeding values plus a massive Government financed cropland retirement program. The other is a voluntary combined wheat and feed grain program introduced by Representative QUIE and others. It would provide for wheat at 65 percent of parity with acreage diversion payments equal to half of the value of the crop not produced.

A third wheat proposal now is being drafted by Senator MCGOVERN. It is essentially the wheat certificate plan which was defeated in the May vote, except that participation in it would be voluntary; there would be no penalties on wheat producers for planting more wheat than the Secretary of Agriculture determines needed in a marketing year; and there would be no diversion payments. This proposal avoids compulsion and institutes the economic incentives of the certificates for the land diversion payments of the present feed grain program. Part of the cost thus would be borne by the consumers rather than by the public treasury.

In the absence of any new legislation and no special acreage diversion programs, about 300 million bushels of additional wheat are expected to be harvested next year. About a third of this probably would come from acres diverted from land planted to feed grains in 1963—mainly, grain sorghum, oats, and barley. This would leave the estimated net addition to the feed grain supply in the neighborhood of 200 million bushels of feed wheat.

This could be enough to upset the feed grain diversion program. And it could have some important implications to the livestock and poultry industry. Certainly some of this additional wheat would find its way into broilers and turkeys—which compete with Midwest pork and beef, as well as affecting the Midwest turkey industry directly. And some would find its way into additional egg production, which affects the Midwest egg producer

Some of the wheat would replace corn that would otherwise be fed to livestock. Then this corn would go under loan and be taken over by the CCC. The net result could be to offset as much as three-fourths of the reduction in feed grain stocks next year than would otherwise take place. And if weather were good and participation drops off a little more, it could completely offset the diversion brought about by the 1964 feed grain program.

In the face of this possibility, the USDA has outlined several administrative actions which tie the wheat situation in more closely with the feed grain legislation which was passed by Congress this spring.

The possibilities being considered by the USDA include a feed grain program with higher payments which diverts additional acres of feed grain—enough to offset some of the increased wheat which will be planted this fall and next spring. Another possibility being considered to establish cross compliance between wheat allotments and the feed grain program. That is, to participate in the feed grain program, the wheat producer must also stay within his wheat allotment.

A third possibility being considered is to permit substitution between wheat and feed grain on the wheat allotment land and the permitted feed grain acres. This was one of the provisions in the wheat program which was voted on in May. An additional proviso now would be that the farmer would be required to make an extra diversion of grain acreage in excess of the minimum as a condition for exercising the privilege of substitution.

The problem is to develop and enact some effective voluntary wheat adjustment program that involves relatively low Government cost. The danger we face is that wheat producers will produce several hundred million bushels of wheat next year for which there will be no market other than livestock feed. This extra wheat first will depress feed grain prices next spring and summer. Then, when it is fed, the resulting increased livestock and poultry marketings in the fall of 1964 and in 1965 will depress livestock and poultry farmers' incomes.

More is at stake than solely the wheat farmer's interests. It is impossible to run a reasonable cost, effective feed grain program in the face of unlimited wheat production.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have received many comments from my State relating to the Supreme Court's decision on Bible reading and prayer in public schools as I am sure other Members of the Senate have received.

Reactions from the people from Florida have been of every kind—approving and disapproving, moderate, and immoderate, carefully drawn and carelessly stated.

One of the most thoughtful comments I have seen is an editorial which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Florida Baptist Witness which is published in Jacksonville.

I am glad to ask that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD for the attention of all Senators and all citizens.

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

[From the Florida Baptist Witness, June 27, 1963]

THE RULING ON BIBLE READING IN THE SCHOOLS

Because many educators, churchmen and journalists had already accurately forecast the Court's decision, there was no great surprise when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled last week that required reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools are unconstitutional.

Coming at an opportune time—when most of the school children are out of the classroom on a long summer vacation—the ruling will not occasion an abrupt halt to practices which the Court has ruled unconstitutional as "religious ceremonies."

The Court held that required recitation of the Lord's Prayer and reading of the Bible in public schools constitute "religious ceremony" and violate the first amendment to the Constitution which forbids "establishment" of religion by government.

Obviously, if the Court was to be consistent, in view of last year's ruling regarding the so-called Regent's Prayer in New York, it could reach no other conclusion.

It is estimated that the Court required nearly 50,000 words to hand down its decision in the Pennsylvania and Maryland cases on which the ruling was made.

Justice Tom C. Clark, in private life a prominent Presbyterian layman, delivered the opinion of the Court, but only Chief Justice Earl Warren, Associate Justice Hugo L. Black and Associate Justice Byron White fully concurred with him.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., the only Roman Catholic member, delivered a separate concurring opinion, nearly 25,000 words in length.

Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, the only Jewish member, with whom Justice John Marshall Harlan joined, also delivered a separate concurring opinion, but it was brief, a little more than 1,000 words long.

Justice William O. Douglas again voiced his very strong personal views on church-state separation in a short separate opinion.

Justice Potter Stewart delivered a 4,000-word dissent in which he did not actually disagree with the findings of the majority but said he thought the issues were so complicated that the cases should be remanded to the lower courts "for the taking of additional evidence."

In delivering the opinion of the Court, Justice Clark said that the Constitution requires the Government to be absolutely neutral with respect to the religious beliefs of its citizens.

"The place of religion in our society is an exalted one," he declared, "achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church, and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind."

"We have come to recognize through bitter experience that it is not within the power of government to invade that citadel," he warned, "whether its purpose or effect is to aid or oppose, to advocate or retard."

"In the relationship between man and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality," Justice Clark stated.

He went to quite some length to insist that the Court is not hostile to religion. "It is argued," he said, "that unless these religious exercises are permitted, a 'religion of secularism' is established in the schools."

"We agree, of course, that the state may not establish a 'religion of secularism' in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus 'preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.' "

"We do not agree, however, that this decision in any sense has that effect," said Justice Clark.

"In addition," he said, "it might well be said that one's education is incomplete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its history and historic qualities."

"Nothing we have said here," he emphasized, "indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the first amendment."

"But the exercises here do not fall into these categories," he asserted. "They are religious exercises required by the States in violation of the command of the first amendment that the Government maintain strict neutrality, neither aiding nor opposing religion."

In showing that the "free exercise" clause of the first amendment is not violated by the Court's ruling, Justice Clark said, "While the free exercise clause clearly prohibits the use of state action to deny the rights of free exercise to anyone, it has never meant that the majority could use the machinery of the state to practice its beliefs."

He also made it plain that such practices as the opening of congressional sessions with prayer, the presence of chaplains in the Armed Forces, etc., are not prohibited by the ruling.

Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, with whom Justice John Marshall Harlan joined, concurred in the result of the ruling but warned that the Constitution must not be interpreted in a manner hostile to religion.

"It is said, and I agree," said Justice Goldberg, "that the attitude of the state toward religion must be one of neutrality. But untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality can lead to invocation or approval of results which partake not simply of the noninterference or noninvolvement with religion which the Constitution commands, but of a broader and persuasive devotion to the secular and a passive—even active—hostility toward religion."

Such hostility is "not only not compelled by the Constitution," said Justice Goldberg, "but it seems to me is prohibited by it."

SOME OBSERVATIONS

While the Court has ruled that it is unconstitutional for a government to require by law the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools, it has not so ruled on voluntary prayer or Bible reading.

The Court has clearly expressed itself regarding the relevance of religion to our American heritage and its significance to our way of life.

The Court has, it now appears, left the way open for objective study of the Bible (especially for its history and historic qualities) in the public schools as a valid part of a secular program of education.

The ruling, and particularly the concurring opinion of Justice Douglas, makes it harder for the proponents of public aid for parochial schools to bring to fruition their demands to help out of public tax funds.

The ruling forces upon parents anew a more serious consideration of their responsibility for the moral and religious training of their children in the home and the church.

The decision has served to accent again the tremendous contribution to freedom which has been and is being made by the American principle of separation of church and state.

While there are some implications of the ruling, some appearances of a trend, with which we cannot be happy, we believe that in the long run it holds for us more good than bad. Admittedly, the first reaction of many people is well expressed by the accompanying cartoon by Jack Hamm. We believe, however, that after careful study and reflection upon it, a great many Baptists will conclude that it is not an evil ruling.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] on his initiative today in proposing this farm legislation, and, above all, on his dedication to the economic and social well-being of our family farms. The Senator from South Dakota is one of the most able and competent authorities on the subject of agricultural policy, having served in the House of Representatives on the Committee on Agriculture, and having taken a keen interest in agricultural legislation throughout his entire public career.

The Senator is presenting to the Senate a proposal on wheat legislation which I believe deserves the careful attention and consideration of Congress. I am confident it will receive such consideration.

This is one of the most difficult assignments we must carry out in Congress. I hope that, whatever we do in the future in connection with agricultural legislation, we will keep in mind the central theme of better utilization of our abundance.

I recall that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made a brilliant speech in the Senate earlier this session, as he has done many times, in which he urged the use of our great productivity, not merely surplus disposal; and, better yet, that we look upon our agricultural resources as a valuable asset for strength in America and throughout the world. I am convinced that this can be done; and that we can use this abundance and at the same time improve the price structure for our agricultural producers.

The farm families of America need a program, a policy, and an attitude of Government which lends itself to better marketing and distribution of the products of our farms at fair and reasonable prices—products which provide not merely sustenance but a fair profit on investment and labor and managerial talent.

I have just returned from a weekend visit to my home State of Minnesota. Incidentally, I went to South Dakota to see my mother. I flew over these fertile fields, from the southwestern corner of Minnesota into the Sioux Falls area, across Minnehaha County, up to Huron, and over Beadle County and Codington County, to Watertown; then due east from Watertown to Minneapolis. Anyone who sees that land and those farm homes and the investments which those farmers have in property and facilities, such as machinery, seed, and buildings, as well as in plain skill and competence, cannot help being impressed with the importance of our agricultural economy and the great value of it to our Nation. Therefore, we must be greatly concerned with what happens to prices.

I flew back to Washington last night with a member of the Board of the Farm Credit Administration. He pointed out to me that if the wheat price collapses, many of the assets of the Farm Credit Administration, as well as of other agricultural credit organizations, will be destroyed, because those loans were made to farmers and farm producers predicated not upon wheat at $1 or $1.25 a bushel, but at $1.75 to $2 a bushel.

We should face the fact that unless something is done dangerous consequences can result.

What is to be done is the debatable question. Many proposals are before us. I do not intend at this moment to argue what I consider to be the merits of those proposals, but I say to the administration, as one of its loyal supporters, that we cannot content ourselves with doing nothing. Let that be clear. Nor can we content ourselves with blaming somebody else if things go wrong. As Senators, we have a responsibility regardless of political party. The Government has a responsibility, because the prices of farm products are directly related to the general prosperity of the Nation.

I wish there were as much concern for the development of our agricultural economy as there is for the Common Market in Western Europe. I wish we could see as clearly the potentialities for an expanded merchandising and sale of goods and equipment in the agricultural economy of America if our farmers received fair prices for their goods as we apparently see in the possibilities in foreign trade. I believe in foreign trade, but I believe it is easier to do business with fellow Americans than it is to do business overseas. If we were to devote as much attention to developing the American economy in terms of fair prices and reasonable returns upon investment as we do in terms of trying to develop other economies, some of our balance-of-

payments problems and other problems would diminish.

We do not need to think of the problem as being "either/or". I do not say we should ignore our foreign responsibilities. To the contrary, I believe in foreign aid; I support it. I believe in the Export-Import Bank and its operations. I will continue to support it. I believe in our program of an expanded foreign trade. We must do everything we can to expand trade in the European trade area, in Latin America, in Asia, and in Africa.

But if we could have wheat selling at $2 a bushel, dairy products at somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of parity, and poultry products and other farm products at anywhere near parity, the factories of America would have to expand to provide the goods and services that could be and would be purchased in rural America. Some of the most urgent needs in rural America are yet unmet. The possibilities for housing and home furnishing, the possibilities for the automobile industry, the possibilities for a thousand and one products are unlimited.

That is why the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] or any other Member of this body who seeks to find a better way to provide an opportunity for a reasonable return on investment in the farm areas of America is doing a service, in particular for agriculture, but also for everyone else.

I wish the Senator from South Dakota well in his enterprise. I know that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will carefully consider his proposal. Frankly, I have not had the opportunity I would have liked to have to study the proposal in detail. I know it is based upon the principles of a fair agricultural program, a program which has worked well.

What is important is that there are persons who exercise independence of judgment, regardless of what anyone says either in the executive branch or the legislative branch, persons who are willing to make proposals that they believe are in the national interest.

I assure the Senator from South Dakota of my interest in his proposal and of my desire to be helpful. I shall study his bill with careful attention.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Minnesota in commending the junior Senator from South Dakota for his proposal on wheat legislation. I am impressed, because the Senator from South Dakota represents a great wheat-producing State. It is my understanding that South Dakota is one of the most predominantly farming States in the Nation. The Senator from South Dakota is an expert in agriculture and a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There has been much pessimism on the part of farmers who have felt that because of the wheat referendum, there is now no hope, and that the wheat farmer is sure to suffer a drastic drop in income. If the wheat farmer suffers such a drop in income, all Americans will suffer, and substantially so.

The farmer is an important segment of our economy. He buys more steel than anyone else, including the automobile industry. He buys more oil than is purchased by any of the armed services. He buys enormous amounts of electricity. If the farmer's income drops, there will surely be a depressing effect on the economy.

I believe it is important that we act on this kind of constructive legislation, provided it will not increase the cost to the Government, and will significantly improve opportunities for wheat farmers to earn the kind of income which they deserve.

REFORM OF FEDERAL BUDGET—THE FACTS CONGRESS DOES NOT HAVE ON FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal budget is undoubtedly the single most important economic document of the Federal Government. It contains within it the dollar magnitudes of every policy decision which is made by the executive and legislative branches of our Government. It is a focal point for any decisions which this Government must make concerning the impact of the Government upon our private economy. It is the tool through which we obtain—or try to obtain—efficiency in Government operations. It is also the primary instrument for redistributing incomes among individuals, and it is the primary tool in influencing the levels of employment and economic activity. We in Congress have a responsibility to understand this document because it is we who must make the final decisions contained in it.

Because of the importance of the Federal budget, a member of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Roy Moor, who is a brilliant economist, was asked by the Committee over a year ago to do a study of the nature of the Federal budget and its usefulness in analyzing the economic impact of the Federal Government. This study, entitled "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," and published by the committee in 1962, is, I believe, the most definitive study ever done on this subject.

It received wide acclaim from economists and other experts, including budget directors in the various States, before our committee. Following the publication of this study, the Statistics Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Joint Economic Committee, held hearings on the usefulness of the Federal budget and the types of changes in the document which could make it more useful, both to Congressmen and to others interested in financial details of government. These hearings were notable for the high degree of unanimity among the witnesses concerning the types of changes that should be made in the budget.

REPORT ON BUDGET DUE

The subcommittee will shortly release its report on these hearings, summarizing the views of the witnesses as well as the members of the subcommittee. I urge every Member of this body at least to examine the recommendations contained within this report. The recommendations are practical; they are a means by which to make the budget more useful for each of us in Congress. It is my intention, Mr. President, during the next few meetings of the Senate, to give a series of short speeches summarizing and emphasizing the nature of the conclusions contained within this report.

The first—and undoubtedly the most important—single recommendation in the subcommittee report concerns the arrangement of the materials contained in the document. At present, the entire budget, with the exception of one page, is arranged by individual agencies. There is, of course, historical justification for this arrangement. It is an individual agency which must go before the Bureau of the Budget and later the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in order to obtain grants of new obligational authority. An agency cannot, in general, be held responsible for the actions or expenditures made by other agencies of the Government. Moreover, in an earlier day, specific functions of government were generally associated with a single, a particular, a specific agency.

However, times have changed. Now virtually any given function that we can name is performed in more than one agency of the Government. The effect, therefore, is that a budget presented along agency lines never gives information on the total amounts appropriated or spent by the Government for each of the various functions of the Government. The effect, in essence, therefore, is that we who make final decisions concerning Government expenditures never know the total amounts that are being spent for these purposes.

Let me give several examples. We are all concerned at the present time about our balance-of-payments situation.

HOW MUCH DO WE SPEND ON FOREIGN AID? NO ONE KNOWS

Only a few minutes ago the Joint Economic Committee concluded the first day's hearings on the subject of balance of payments. As a member of that committee I heard witnesses on the report of the Brookings Institution, an outstanding research foundation.

We have heard the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary of the Treasury on this subject.

Congress generally, and the Joint Economic Committee in particular, is deeply concerned about our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury recently told us that unless we are able to improve the situation in the next year or two, it may be necessary for the Government to take drastic and painful action. By that, the Secretary was referring, of course, to the possibility of curtailing our commitments to our friends and allies throughout the world. It may be necessary for our Government to take action which might conceivably have a harmful effect on the ability of this country to defend the free world against communism.

One of the principal ingredients in our balance-of-payments position is the amount of our foreign aid. Yet I defy

any Member of the Senate to tell me from the budget how much we are spending in total assistance to foreign countries. Let us assume that one of you took me up on my dare and attempted to determine this amount. You would presumably first look in a neat little volume presented by the Bureau of the Budget called the "Budget in Brief." This gives an amount for "international affairs and finance." However, it does not indicate amounts spent by a series of agencies such as the Department of Defense and the Office of the President for military assistance. The amount does not include Public Law 480 funds provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation. It does not indicate amounts contained within various special loan programs of quasi-independent agencies.

If you continued in your search for the total funds spent on foreign assistance, you would probably next go to the large appendix volume indicating appropriation requests. The index to this volume indicates a reference to the Agency for International Development. However, some 23 other agencies and activities also have the term "international" in their titles, and this does not involve the activities listed under "foreign" or the activities which are foreign in character but not so designed in the budget. It is literally impossible to determine from the budget or any other published source how much our Government is spending overseas. But how can we assess what we may do or should do with respect to our balance of payments if we do not know what our Government is doing? Furthermore, I hereby challenge anyone in the administration to provide Congress with information on the total amount of Federal funds spent overseas. How much does our Government spend? The fact is no one knows.

EDUCATION? SAME STORY—NO ONE KNOWS

Many similar examples could also be given. How much does the Federal Government spend for education? Apparently some 66 different educational programs are provided by at least 9 different departments of the Government, and at least 23 additional programs are given by 11 other agencies. No single figure in the budget indicates the total expenditures of the Federal budget for education. How can we in the Congress possibly make decisions concerning the appropriateness of the educational activities of the Federal Government when we cannot even find out what these are?

Similar examples can be given for the health activities of the Federal Government, for research and development programs, for lending operations, for insurance programs, and so on. One might almost conclude that adherence to outmoded historical customs in the budget has been used as a device to conceal from the American people what the Government is doing.

ADEQUATE INDEX REQUIRED

What can we do to remedy this situation? The first step must be to establish an index system based on the types of activities in which the Federal Government engages. Thus, if we as Congressmen or as citizens wish to know the total amount of foreign expenditures being provided by the Federal Government, we would simply look in the index under the heading of "foreign expenditures." I do not wish to minimize the difficulty of this first step. In order to do it successfully, it is necessary to catalog and describe the actual activities of the Federal Government. However, I would simply ask this question: How can we possibly know what the Government is doing unless such a cataloging is made?

The Bureau of the Budget has certainly gone a short distance along this route. It has established a classification system in order to show a single page in the budget which describes in most general—and, I should say, inadequate—terms a functional breakdown of expenditures. However, this classification system is used solely for the purpose of constructing this single table in the budget.

The second step in the reform of the budget, after such an index system has been established, would be to send this index to each of the various agencies of Government and to instruct the agencies to classify their dollars of expenditures under the various functional headings. Once this has been done, the Bureau of the Budget could then simply accumulate the amounts under each of the detailed headings. The result would be a budget organized along program lines, rather than along agency lines. This is what budgetary users, including Congressmen, are interested in—namely, the total expenditures by individual programs or functions of the Government.

Is this approach feasible?

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SHOWS THAT THE PROGRAM BUDGET WORKS

Would it permit us to cut our spending? The fact that this approach can work brilliantly is demonstrated by the operation of the Defense Department under the Kennedy administration. Under the outstanding leadership of Secretary McNamara, the Defense Department, our largest single spending agency, arranges and presents its expenditures and requests for new appropriations under five major functional categories: military personnel; operations and maintenance; procurement; research and development; and military construction. Until that was done, no one could tell how much we spent on military personnel or on procurement. But now the answer is available. Certainly it is a relevant and pertinent fact, and should be known. It is known now because the Defense Department is now organized in an efficient way which enables this information to be made available.

This is a major reason why the Department of Defense may be able to achieve savings of $4 billion per year, as Secretary McNamara has indicated that he may be able to do.

TIME AGENCIES DISCOVERED THE SCORE

There is a broader answer to the question of feasibility. The question can be rephrased, in effect, to ask: Do the agencies know what they are doing? If agencies are aware of the nature of the products and services that they are producing, then they should be able to associate costs with those activities. If they do not know the nature of their own output, then it is certainly time for the Bureau of the Budget to force them to discover what they are doing. The key point here is that no one else, including the Congress, can learn about these activities unless the agencies present them in an understandable manner.

Let me make clear that this recommendation involves no change with respect to our appropriation process. Since individual agencies will be assembling the material concerning appropriations and expenditures, one cross-classification of this material will be to retain the agency groupings for purposes of presentations to the Appropriations Committees. At the same time, however, the Appropriations Committees will have more information upon which to base appropriations decisions, since the expenditures within each agency will be subdivided by the functions to be performed.

COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGES

Mr. President, many advantages will stem from the revised approach that our subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee has recommended. A principal advantage is that we in Congress shall be able to relate the functions being performed by the Government to the costs of these functions. As a result, we shall be able to compare costs incurred by different agencies for the same types of functions, such as various educational programs being provided by the Government. We shall, therefore, be able to determine which agencies are high-cost producers of services and which agencies are providing benefits more efficiently.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is no accident that Secretary McNamara has introduced into the budget of the Defense Department this type of comparison. He is an eminently successful businessman, and he has also been successful in teaching business administration at Harvard Business School. He knows how this procedure operates, and he knows that it is perhaps the only way to bring some discipline and force—obtained from the system which has made American private enterprise so successful—into the operation of the Government. This method is working well in the Defense Department. Why should we not try it throughout the Government establishment?

More basically, however, we shall begin to learn what the total costs of services are; and, therefore, we shall be able to judge more effectively which services can be efficiently expanded and which should be curbed because of their high cost. This, I believe, is an essential prerequisite to effective budgetmaking by the executive branch and the Congress, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this recommendation of the subcommittee.

OUR PARALYZED CONGRESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on July 28, the Milwaukee Journal published as a feature story in its editorial section

an article by its outstandingly capable Washington reporter, Ira Kapenstein. The article is a very disturbing one. It is entitled "'Scandal' in Washington: Our Paralyzed Congress." In the article Mr. Kapenstein points out that whereas throughout the world there is a great deal of concern about the Great Britain scandals involving security, sex, and so forth, the growing scandal of U.S. congressional inactivity and paralysis may have more far-reaching and permanently adverse effects on our Government. Both the Milwaukee Journal and Mr. Kapenstein are responsible and careful. Mr. Kapenstein is a very thoughtful reporter, and the editors of the Milwaukee Journal are very careful about what it prints, and deliberately avoid any sensationalism.

This analysis in one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers by a topflight reporter deserves careful consideration by the Members of Congress, particularly in accordance with the recommendations made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"SCANDAL" IN WASHINGTON: OUR PARALYZED CONGRESS—SENSE OF CRISIS GROWS IN CAPITAL AS TIME SLIPS BY WITHOUT ACTION ON BILLS NEEDED TO DEAL WITH URGENT PROBLEMS; REFORM MEASURES, TOO, BOG DOWN IN COMMITTEES

(By Ira Kapenstein)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There is a growing scandal in the Nation's Capital that is casting a shadow across the entire country. It is not so sensational as the sex and security scandal that is rocking the Government of Great Britain, but it is perhaps even more dangerous to the United States because it imperils the Nation stealthily, without arousing widespread public awareness.

It is the paralysis of Congress. As month after month slips by and the 88th Congress seems increasingly helpless to deal with the crucial issues confronting it, the scandal which seethes just below the surface on Capitol Hill threatens to break out into the open.

Every year, the reformers raise their voices in anguish and plead with Congress to modernize its machinery and its methods so that democracy can be put to work in the legislative branch of Government.

Every year, reform bills have been introduced, but only once in the last 50 years—in 1946—has even a partial reform effort been successful.

HELPLESS 88TH CONGRESS

But now, there seems to be a slowly growing awareness that something has to be done. The utter helplessness of the 88th Congress might provide the spur that the reformers need.

"The biggest roadblock to democracy in this country," one Capital observer said recently, "is the Congress of the United States."

While that judgment might be too harsh, it symbolizes the frustration that the executive branch faces in trying to get its program through Congress and the monumental task that the reformers face in trying to change the system.

The defects that cause the paralysis of Congress have existed for many years. The big difference is that the urgency of the problems has become so dramatic.

In January, 3 days before the 88th Congress began, James Reston of the New York Times made a safe prediction. He wrote:

"The 88th Congress starting in a few days promises to be a standoff, a scoreless tie, a dull battle between the Kennedy offense and the committee chairmen or defensive unit of the Congress.

"The proceedings will be largely formal and technical. The President will go to the Hill and define the state of the Union in iambic pentameter. He will speak in continents and epochs and define the challenge of change.

"Then, after partisan applause and general approval of the soaring phrases of Ted Sorensen, the Chinese Bandits will take over. The vast panorama of the Nation in the world will be cut up into little pieces. Each committee chairman will vanish into his privileged sanctuary with his special part of the picture. And the vast, decentralized, congressional machine will begin to grind."

Congress is actually a loose association of virtually autonomous committees. The committees are headed by powerful chairmen, who get their important positions not according to ability but according to seniority.

The function of congressional leadership is scattered among the chairmen of more than 300 committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and select committees.

Southern Democrats, because they come from politically safe States or districts where they keep getting reelected, dominate the chairmanships of the most important committees.

The case of Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, is an illuminating one. Passman is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations. He also is one of the stanchest opponents of foreign aid in Congress.

Despite his loudly stated dislike for foreign aid, PASSMAN remains as the key man in the appropriation of funds for the program.

HITS OWN PARTY'S AIMS

"The spectacle of an appropriations chairman loudly proclaiming his opposition to this basic policy of the Democratic Party which gave him his assignment, is symptomatic of the disorganization of Congress," the Washington Post said in a recent editorial.

Of all the proposed congressional reforms, those aimed at modifying or abolishing the seniority system have the least chance of getting anyplace. Yet many of the other problems in the organization of Congress stem from the seniority system.

One Democrat in the House complained recently that congressional time is poorly organized, that sessions are too long, that the Rules Committee holds back bills, that committee chairmen have too much power to block bills or ram through pet projects, that too many old men are in control, that some chairmen abuse their powers by taking junkets and failing to call committee meetings.

"If you could put a check on the seniority system, most of these problems would disappear," he said. "Knowing that they might be replaced, the committee chairmen would get to work early in the session, stay on the job and push hard to move the program.

Old men, with no assurance that they could cling to power, would give way to younger men.

Major proposals to reform the seniority system include election of committee slates in the party caucuses without following seniority, election of committee chairmen by the members of the committee and an age limit of 70 for a chairman.

Other suggested reforms in committee procedures include uniform published committee rules of procedure, elimination of overlapping jurisdictions and a time limit on consideration of bills by a committee.

In addition to the problems of seniority in the committee system, the reformers list six other major areas of concern:

1. The rules of House and Senate often prevent effective action, thus thwarting the majority will.

2. The fiscal machinery of Congress leads to a fragmented appropriations process because of the system of first passing authorization bills and later providing the funds in appropriations bills.

3. The workload and scheduling is getting heavier every year, because of the increase in the number of measures and the scope of problems that Congress has to consider and because of the increase in the number of constituents.

4. Unethical conduct by some Members of Congress has cast a pall over all Members. Nepotism, junketing and conflicts of interest have badly hurt congressional prestige, while little has been done by Congress to eliminate the abuses.

5. The elective machinery, with its inequitable districting, leads to an imbalance of constituents among House Members, creating inequities in workloads and representation.

6. Election costs have skyrocketed while sources of legitimate campaign funds are harder to find.

PROPOSED CURBS ON RULES

Proposals to change the role of the House Rules Committee include making it merely a scheduling committee and making it an instrument of the majority leadership. One proposal would forbid the Rules Committee to pass on the merits of legislation and would permit committee chairmen or the majority leader to call up a bill for a vote after a limited time. Another proposal would allow the majority leader to appoint the committee chairman.

Other House rules changes include granting the minority more control of time in House debate and reducing the number of names needed on a petition to discharge any House committee from consideration of a measure from the current number of 218, which is a majority of the House.

Proposals to change Senate rules include measures which would lower the votes needed to limit debate from two-thirds of those present and voting to either three-fifths or to a simple majority of 51.

There also have been suggestions to limit individual Senate speeches to 3 hours, to require that debate be relevant, to eliminate various stalling tactics and to ban written Senate speeches except by the floor manager of a bill and leader of the opposition.

Suggestions to ease the workload include increasing allowances for congressional staffs, delegating authority for appointing postmasters and approving service academy appointments, delegating immigration and naturalization and small claims bills to independent agencies and delegating constituent case work problems to an independent constituent service agency.

Problems of unethical conduct would be corrected by placing closer curbs on trips at Government expense and by creating a code of ethics which would: Require disclosure of major financial interests and stock transactions, forbid the use of confidential information for private purposes, require disclosure of communications with contracting or regulatory agencies on matters under consideration by them and forbid outside employment. Nepotism also would be ruled out.

LA FOLLETTE'S REFORMS

Proposed changes in the elective machinery would extend direct primary elections to all States, increase the terms of House Members to 3 or 4 years, limit the number of consecutive terms a Congressman may

serve, provide Government funds for campaigns, set strict limits on expenditures and create more equitable congressional districts.

The last time Congress took a searching look at its own establishment, it set up a joint committee on the organization of Congress, with the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Wisconsin Progressive-Republican, as chairman. The vice chairman was Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. MONRONEY is now a Senator.

The La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 abolished a large number of obsolete committees, consolidated the remaining ones and made a number of other streamlining reforms.

A number of bills to get the reform process started again have been introduced in this session of Congress. A Senate rules subcommittee held a 1-day hearing a month ago on a bill by Senator CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, to set up a 12-member Commission on Congressional Reorganization to be comprised of six Members of Congress and six experts appointed by the President. The subcommittee has not acted on the bill.

Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, one of the most consistent voices heard in favor of sweeping congressional reforms, has introduced a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Organization.

Representatives REUSS, Democrat, of Milwaukee, and LINDSAY, Republican, of New York have introduced legislation to create commissions made up of Congressmen and outsiders to study reorganization. Representatives HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, and CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, have been seeking foundation assistance to set up a nonpartisan study.

Whether any of the proposals to get a study going will succeed in this session is not known. There is a great deal of skepticism.

But the voices of protest are growing louder as the stalemate in Congress continues. A sense of crisis is beginning to pervade the Capital.

SENATE CONSIDERATION OF TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate has now begun its consideration of the treaty banning atomic testing in the atmosphere, under the seas, and in outer space, prior to determining whether it shall advise and consent to this treaty.

This morning members of the three committees—the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Committee on Armed Services—met and discussed the treaty.

I hope that the Senate's consideration will be searching, objective, and fair. This is an extremely important document—a treaty that will affect our national security and, of course, our international position. It is my personal conviction—a conviction reached after the most detailed study over a period of many years—that such a treaty is in the national interest of the United States and is in the interest of a more just and peaceful society. But I also will expect the various representatives of the administration to establish the case for this treaty before the appropriate committees of the Senate and the Senate itself. Nothing should be taken for granted in a matter of such importance to this Nation and the world.

The right to full and searching debate ought to be exercised by both those disposed toward this treaty and those who currently harbor doubts and uncertainties. The coming discussion and debate on the proposed treaty to ban nuclear test in the three environments could very well give us an excellent opportunity for a far-reaching and a far-ranging discussion of American foreign policy, particularly our relationships with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. I am hopeful that such will be the case. It is my view that a sensible, constructive, and thoughtful debate on the subject of our relationships with the countries behind the Iron Curtain is long overdue. We need a little more light and studious consideration on the subject, and possibly not quite as much pettifogging and emotion about it. We have a grave responsibility in the matter. A careful and searching examination of all the facts relating to this treaty is a definite prerequisite toward meeting this responsibility.

We need to ask ourselves whether or not the proposed treaty would adversely affect our military posture. We need to ask ourselves whether or not the treaty would deny us the opportunity for the improvement of our vehicles of delivery or our delivery systems. We need to ask ourselves whether or not the treaty would complicate our research in the field of atomic energy. I believe there are many other questions that should be asked. We will expect precise and factual replies from the various administration witnesses coming before the appropriate Senate committees.

This morning we were able to underscore the fact that there had been no secret understandings that would in any way prejudice the treaty or expand its application. We were able to discuss objectively and sensibly some of the motivations, as we see them, for the Soviet Union's willingness to accept such a treaty. All those questions will be gone into in great detail—and properly so. The American people have a right to know whether or not the proposed treaty will lend itself toward reducing the arms race, toward curtailing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and possibly toward opening more new and honorable discussions of the differences that now, and for so long, have existed between the Soviet system, on the one hand, and the system of freedom, as we know it, on the other. I am hopeful that such discussions will take place. I do not see any immediate solution to our difficulties, but there are no solutions to be found in refusing to study, to search, to probe, and to negotiate.

The most eloquent case in behalf of ratification was presented Friday night by the President of the United States. Hopefully, it sets the tone for the debate and consideration that will occur in the coming weeks on the Senate floor.

I hope that every Member of Congress will read the speech. Most of us heard it. It was, indeed, a moving and thoughtful address. I understand that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has already inserted the President's message in the RECORD. Therefore, I shall not ask that it be reprinted again. But I do hope that every Member will find time in their busy schedules to read it carefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column, "Historic Achievement?—Test-Ban Accord May Go Down as a Great Deed in Statecraft," by Arthur Krock that appeared in yesterday's New York Times, and an editorial, "Weighing the Dangers," that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, also be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT?—TEST-BAN ACCORD MAY GO DOWN AS A GREAT DEED IN STATECRAFT

(By Arthur Krock)

From the moment science made it known that as a result of fallout from indefinite testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, the earth's inhabitants could be born cancerous and eventually eliminated, the public pressure on statesmen of the atomic powers for a test-ban agreement has mounted steadily.

When it became a commonsense conclusion that no thorough shelter system could be devised for the masses of population within the radius of a nuclear bombing attack, this pressure moved the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to a momentous decision. It was, that the necessity of concluding a test-ban treaty with Communist Russia far outweighed the risks implicit for the West in any treaty whose effectiveness is dependent on the sincerity of the Kremlin's professed veto of nuclear war as a means to conquer the world.

Now this decision has materialized in the test-ban articles signed at Moscow between the three principal nuclear powers, to which a fourth—France—has the option of adhering. And, though the fifth great nation with a rising nuclear weapons potential—Communist China—is not considered in the least likely to avail itself of the same option, the Moscow articles, if carried out in good faith by all the signatories, will strongly restrain that potential in time and degree—perhaps even confine it to its present primitive status.

PLACE IN HISTORY

Viewed from the humanitarian aspect, the test-ban treaty takes its place in history as a step toward what conceivably could become one of the greatest accomplishments of civilized statecraft. If duly ratified, and scrupulously executed by the immediate signatories, it could rescue earth's creatures from the threats of extermination—one, by nuclear warfare; the other by slow but sure deterioration of the fiber of all life on the planet. And, in these circumstances, history would add the names of President Kennedy, Prime Minister Macmillan, and Premier Khrushchev to the small top roster of statesmen who have permanently advanced the condition of mankind.

POLITICAL GAIN

But the agreement must also be inspected from the standpoint of the political gain it may contribute to the first two heads of state, and perhaps even to the third (although the closed Soviet society makes impossible a reliable assessment of this, or Khrushchev's need of it). And the logical conclusion from this inspection is that the signing has given a powerful lift to the present political influence of the President and the Prime Minister; and that this effect will be lasting if the treaty attains its stated objectives. Should it do that in their time, and also supply a foundation for general, though gradual and practically limited, disarmament, there can be little question that

the constituencies of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan will give them generous political reward.

Both of them need it, which was not the case with President Eisenhower. He sought a test-ban treaty for a much longer period, and against a series of obstructions by the Kremlin that even his endless patience and firm resolve could not dispel. A test-ban treaty was not a campaign issue when the general was elected to his first term. And, when Adlai E. Stevenson in the 1956 campaign proposed a halt to testing—he shifted from his proposition that this be done unilaterally by the United States—Washington-Moscow relations were so hostile that President Eisenhower's rejection of his opponent's idea as an obvious threat to national security was overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people.

EISENHOWER PLAN

But in his second term, by constitutional fiat his last, Eisenhower pursued the goal of a test-ban treaty as persistently and patiently as if his official tenure depended upon the outcome of the enterprise. It was he who first proposed the formula of agreement on which is based the treaty that has now become a part of the executive record of the general's successor. Since there was no political gain for Eisenhower in the terms of keeping or holding office, this record qualifies him for a share in whatever benefits to humanity the test-ban treaty eventually may bestow.

These benefits, as the enormous loopholes in the text disclose, are very far from assured. For example, the text can be read to commit the signatories against the use of nuclear weapons in war, even as retaliation against an attack with conventional weapons. It can be read to assert national jurisdictions in outer space—a principle which the United States entirely rejects. The constitutional duty of the Senate is to examine the treaty microscopically, and in that period it might be disclosed that the administration paid a price for the signature of the U.S.S.R. that, as former Vice President Nixon remarked, could be too high for the merchandise, and dangerous as well. In the judgment of many, such a price would be new "understandings" in Europe and elsewhere by which the U.S.S.R. would consolidate all that it has seized by external aggression and internal subversion.

SENATE APPROVAL?

But the administration is certain to wait on the Senate before conferring with Soviet Russia on the "nonaggression" pact the Kremlin seeks as a supplement to the test-ban treaty. And the forces for Senate approval would seem to be stronger than those opposing. While the text makes it obvious that any of the signatories can cheat, perhaps successfully, in outer space, and also employ the 3-month notice of withdrawal in secret preparations for new testing, thus shattering the heart of the treaty, the factors which create the pressure for Senate approval appear to be much more powerful as political considerations.

It has been a long time since Bernard M. Baruch, representing the United States, offered the U.S.S.R. the choice between the quick and the dead that he said was presented by our proposal of a nuclear weapons test ban, effectively supervised. The total absence of this proviso from the Moscow compact demonstrates, not only that time has passed, but also the whole concept that our national security can never be risked on the good faith of the U.S.S.R.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1963]

WEIGHING THE DANGERS

President Kennedy's sober and earnest speech to the Nation on the test-ban treaty was a very good summary of the objectives of American policy. He was properly cautious in enumerating the advantages of the treaty. He appropriately warned against the hope or expectation that this one transaction might usher in the millennium. The treaty can, as the President pointed out, reduce tensions and pave the way for further steps toward peace, make progress toward freeing the world from the fears of radioactive fallout, contribute to limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and curtail the arms race in ways that will further this Nation's security.

The posture of this Nation, and of the West, in the present circumstances, is one of such subtlety and refinement that it is bound to be attacked by those who prefer simplified solutions. The United States faces Soviet power with a sword in one hand and an olive branch in the other. To those who bluntly believe in reliance upon military power alone this will seem an equivocal position. To those who believe that only an appeal to peace and a resort to unilateral disarmament is required, the policy will seem both equivocal and immoral. Let us hope, however, that the overwhelming majority who take counsel of both their hopes and their fears will find this middle position the sound one and support the Government in both its pursuit of peace and its preparation for war.

No doubt the critics of the President's course and of his speech, will not wait long to point out that the proposed treaty is a departure at points from the position he enunciated on March 2, 1962, when he announced the resumption of thermonuclear testing by this country. The President said then that this country would never be in the position of offering again an uninspected moratorium. He went so far as to suggest that it would be impossible to keep in a state of readiness to test during a moratorium and declared that this alternative had been thoroughly explored and found impossible of execution. Yet, he now is proposing an uninspected moratorium and suggesting that in the event of future jeopardy, we could withdraw from the treaty and resume testing.

The only answer to this contradiction is that the President in March dealt with the then existing knowledge of the situation and now he deals with more and better information. There is greater assurance now than there was then that violations of a ban on experiments in the atmosphere or in outer space can be detected. And it is no longer believed that it is utterly impossible to maintain a state of readiness to resume testing, as the President mistakenly thought last March.

The President also said in 1962 that it was necessary for this country to test in the atmosphere as well as underground in order to carry on research in missile penetration and missile defense, but he is now proposing a treaty that places a limitation on everything but underground testing. We have since conducted our own tests above ground and presumably we did advance our knowledge of the problems involved in the perfection of antimissile missiles but no one has said we have perfected them. But the Soviet Union has not done so either and the test ban's interference with the perfection of this art must work an equal handicap on both and confer advantages on neither.

Upon the resumption of tests, the President spoke regretfully of the damage that increased fallout would inflict upon mankind, but he minimized it as an inconsiderable increase to natural radiation damage and justified the risk as a necessity. He was on higher moral ground on Friday when he said that the loss of one human life or the malformation of one baby should be of concern to us all.

The President was right to describe the treaty as only a first step toward the reduction of world tensions and the elimination of the possibility of thermonuclear war, the horrors of which he so accurately described. It is even a timid first step. Unless it is taken, however, there may be no subsequent steps. It must be acknowledged that it is a step that involves dangers. So will each subsequent step. Danger lies all about us in this thermonuclear age. What we need to know is whether this treaty increases or diminishes the danger, and on that point the evidence available argues eloquently for the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it would seem to me to be very good for Senators during the days ahead, while we are giving thought and consideration to the proposed treaty, to incorporate into the RECORD the thoughtful and well-researched articles that will be published in the press throughout our great country. I make that statement because this period of our deliberations in the Senate will be considered by future generations as a very historic period. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought to be a source of information on the processes of democratic government. It also ought to be a source of information for research purposes for scholars and students of international politics. Therefore Senators can be helpful to the students of international politics and civic leaders throughout our Nation if we bring together from time to time in our hearings before the committees, as well as here in the RECORD, the articles that Senators believe merit the thoughtful consideration of their colleagues.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND A NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a speech and an article relating to a bill which I have introduced which would establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. This bill, S. 1316, would allow the United States to provide grants-in-aid to private groups and States in support of programs and projects which will make significant public contribution in the arts. Through such assistance, the U.S. Government could nurture the precious resource of the Nation's creative ability. The speech delivered by Mrs. Adelyn Breeskin at the annual meeting of the American Federation of the Arts this May dealing with the beneficial effects that the proposed National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963 could have on the arts in general and the article in the Washington Post of June 30, 1963, on traveling exhibitions in Virginia refer to the type of worthwhile project which a National Arts Foundation could help support.

Mrs. Breeskin was previously director of the Baltimore Museum of Art and is now director of the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art. She reports that the Washington Gallery has been an outstanding success and that such a success has been difficult to achieve because little financial help is available to further the arts. Mrs. Breeskin believes that the National Arts Foundation could be an important means of implementing the policies of a National Arts Council as proposed by President Kennedy, by providing funds to match State, city, and

private funds to make grants-in-aid in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution to the arts. Such a foundation would not only encourage cultural and artistic production, but also, provide support for artists, artistic presentations, research, surveys, and planning in the arts, as well as artistic appreciation courses, public lectures, and training classes. All these activities would greatly stimulate artistic and cultural development in the United States.

The Nation should encourage artistic and creative abilities and the appreciation of them. Yet, the United States is the only major nation in the Western World where the Government offers no financial assistance to the arts. The United States has a long way to go to catch up with the policies of other Western nations and S. 1316 is the first step in this direction.

The article reports on the ingenuous new way art is being made available to people in every section of Virginia. Two artmobiles—traveling exhibitions mounted in specially constructed trailer trucks—have visited every corner of the State. Schoolchildren and other inhabitants of remote towns have been stimulated by seeing superb works of art previously unavailable to them. Thus, at a relatively low cost, Virginia has benefited by having her people's appreciation of and ability in creative endeavors increased. Through encouraging such projects at the local level, S. 1316 would similarly benefit the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech and article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW MUSEUM IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(Address by Mrs. Breeskin)

Certainly the fact that the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art is in the Nation's Capital does add a certain significance to it. Otherwise it would be just one more of the many new art museums being constantly launched throughout our country. But Washington is different. The challenge is great to make of this new undertaking a smashing success. The National Gallery, the Freer, the Corcoran, and Ducan Phillip's are all well established art centers, attracting Washingtonians as well as the many thousands of visiting tourists. But a group of 15 art enthusiasts—some of them collectors—felt that there was need of one more gallery here, one that focused on modern art. When I was asked if I would become the director of this Washington Gallery, I did not hesitate to accept since the challenge appealed to me tremendously. I accepted therefore as of December a year ago, came over for monthly board meetings during the spring of 1962, helped to pass on the building—which was bought on July 6 of last year—and worked through last summer on the opening exhibition, the Franz Kline Memorial show, which was launched about November 1 with three separate openings.

We are now all of between 6 and 7 months old. We have a most attractive building, air conditioned, four stories with an elevator which was ordered last July but is not quite completed as yet. The location of our building is excellent, just cater-cornered from the Ducan Phillips Gallery, one block from Dupont Circle, in the heart of Washington. Gradually we are building a permanent collection. So far we have almost 50 works of art in it, all most acceptable gifts. We are also building an art library. We have a sales and rental gallery, a staff of four plus a handyman-guard and a remarkable group of volunteer receptionists and docents. For support we have some foundation grants at least for the next 3 years, and over 1,200 memberships, without any concentrated drive as yet. We charge 50 cents admission, except for school and college classes who are admitted free of charge. To date we have had five major exhibitions, three of which we organized ourselves. For each group we have arranged special evening lectures, plus daily gallery tours.

So far the response to our efforts has been very rewarding indeed. Embassy personnel have been constant visitors. The fact that Mrs. Kennedy is an honorary trustee and has visited us is also most helpful. I cannot say that Senators and Congressmen have flocked to us in any great numbers but this is one of my aims—to attract as many of them as possible and try to interest more of them in what we are doing.

For the 20 years that I was director of the Baltimore Museum of Art, it was necessary for me to appear each year before the board of estimates of the city council to defend our museum budget. The Baltimore museum is dependent on city funds for over two-thirds of its $400,000 yearly budget. Those were hard-boiled politicians who had to give their consent to our budget, with little or no interest in the arts. On one occasion I remember being needled by one such councilman who asked me questions that demanded quick mathematical calculation, which I stumbled over but was then immediately helped out of my difficulty by another of the councilmen who supplied the necessary addition for me. I was so grateful that upon the completion of my arduous session, as I stepped down from the front platform, I took a rosebud that I was wearing in my buttonhole and presented it to my councilman friend in need. This made everyone laugh and resulted in my getting just what I had asked for. One must sometimes resort to such stage play in dealing with uninterested politicians. And I see very little difference between city councilmen and Federal Congressmen by and large.

However, there are some marked exceptions to the general rule, especially the group of superior Senators who introduced the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. The Senators supporting this are Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; PELL, of Rhode Island; JAVITS, of New York; CLARK, of Pennsylvania; and RIBICOFF, of Connecticut. As you have heard the President is about to establish a National Arts Council by Executive order. That will indeed be a fine first step toward the gaining of congressional support of this bill. The National Arts Foundation could then be considered as the means of implementing the Council with the necessary funds with which to match State, city, and private funds to provide grants-in-aid in support of programs and projects which will make a significant public contribution in the arts. This 1963 bill, unlike earlier bills S. 741 and 785, does not limit the arts concerned to the vague visual and performing arts mentioned in these two bills.

Instead, in addition to encouraging artistic and cultural production, it provides for the support of projects by private groups or States that will encourage and assist artists, the commissioning of works, artistic and cultural presentations, and research, surveys and planning in the arts. The bill has been drafted to include the activities of museums, such as eligible artistic appreciation courses, public lectures, training classes, as eligible to receive assistance. This detailed listing is, for all of us, a very important addition.

The Foundation would be subject to the supervision and direction of a board of 21 trustees appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The administrative activities of the Foundation would be supervised by a Director with a salary of $22,500 a year.

With such Government matching funds the training of museum personnel would be a most worthwhile activity and one that is badly needed. Then, too, there is the adequate national representation in all of the various international art exhibitions, such as those in Venice, Sao Paulo, Tokyo, the Documenta in Germany, etc., which demand the expenditure of considerable funds. And we might even be able to commission our artists to provide some of their best works for our embassies around the world. The time has come for us to ask for such matching funds to supply these and many other demands to establish proper representation of our arts throughout the world and to keep abreast of the work of the Arts Council in England and government support of the arts throughout other countries.

Actors' Equity is supporting this proposed bill. The American Federation of Arts might well consider doing likewise, especially now that the scope of the bill has been broadened to include museums and art centers. In connection with the plans for the National Cultural Center in Washington, the arts have been limited to the performing arts. One reason for this is the power of Actors' Equity and ANTA. Also the fact that many performing people feel that theater, ballet and symphony orchestras are in greater need of help than are museums. But this is not so. Our greatest need at this time is, I think, for well-trained personnel—from packers to top administrators. Museum salaries are still too low to compete with either business or the universities. For promotion, too, we need people who are trained to understand what museums are truly about—not people trained just in business. With Government matching funds, our museums could better afford to train personnel. We could also expand our activities, such as lectures, concerts, symposia, etc.

The time has come to strike out for this. Since I am now in Washington, I feel I can try to speak up whenever an opportunity occurs to extend the New Frontier to include the arts more fully and directly. My board of trustees includes in its 15 people a number who are connected with Government. The head of our hospitality committee is the wife of the chief liaison officer of Capitol Hill. The wife of Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman MOORHEAD, also of Pennsylvania, are both on that committee. Senator HUMPHREY is a good friend who keeps in close touch with what we are doing at our gallery.

Altogether I find being in Washington tremendously exciting and stimulating. There is much that can be accomplished and the future looks bright. Our gallery has made a good beginning, and I think our place in the Nation's Capital is assured. It is especially interesting to be there at the beginning of this new era. As Mr. Heckshir said, "So far, the area of the arts, nationally speaking, is uncharted." There are just a few men in each House who are actively interested.

I hope that our gallery can arouse the interest of more of them. This summer we are to show the Museum of Modern Art's exhibit entitled "Alumni of Government Art Projects" meaning WPA and Treasury. Every Congressman is to receive a very special invitation to see this exhibition. It may help to make them realize how tremendously worthwhile Government help to the arts can be. And more directly, it may win more support for the National Arts Foundation bill which I hope will have your full support, not generally speaking, but

as Mr. Nagel suggested yesterday, actively, by writing or speaking to your Congressman and letting him know that you will appreciate their support of this bill which is number S. 1316.

After hearing Mr. Commager's brilliant banquet speech yesterday evening, there seems to be no further need of stating that Government help for the arts is not so dangerous that we should avoid it. The Smithsonian Institution is a good example of successful art activity under Government support that includes the National Gallery, the Freer Gallery, and the National Museum.

I realize that to most Congressmen, modern art is a very special bugaboo. They mistrust it entirely but that is all the more reason to expose them to it. After all, we like what we know. It is up to our Washington Gallery to try to arrange that they see enough of modern art to learn to take it in their stride by becoming more familiar with it. This, therefore, is one of our aims. Another is to make our exhibitions international in scope, since the arts, as Harold Rosenberg pointed out recently, have become completely global.

Many of our visitors are members of foreign embassies. They are keen to study the American art of today but they also are pleased to see the art of their own countries. And artists from abroad are all eager to have their work shown in Washington. You may surmise that diplomacy is needed to contend with the pressures brought to bear on us. However, to offset such a situation the fact that an exhibition schedule is set for the next two seasons, is helpful.

In closing, may I invite you all to come to visit our gallery and then may I urge that each of you will do your best to promote Government support of the arts through the National Arts Foundation bill.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1963]

ARTMOBILE EXHIBITS FOSTER CULTURE

The circulating exhibition has been an important part of museum services throughout the United States for many years. The Museum of Modern Art in New York, the American Federation of Arts, the Smithsonian Institution and other organizations have exhibition services that bring art to regional centers that otherwise would have no opportunity to see original work of high caliber.

But there is one difficulty inherent in all circulating exhibitions, and that is the lack of local facilities to display and present these materials. Even when wall space is available, there are such problems as lack of proper lighting, labeling, insurance protection, and public relations. These lacks can make a fiasco of an often carefully arranged and studied group of works. Even so seemingly simple an operation as wrapping and unwrapping the objects, installing them or taking them down, can lead to countless difficulties if the work is done by someone who does not know how to take proper care of fragile displays.

For these reasons, circulating exhibits tend to be of less value than if they could be properly displayed and protected. Indeed, in many cases the shows must be completely expendable, so hard is travel on the mounts, frames and works of art themselves. In addition, such heavy objects as sculpture often cannot be shipped at all because the cost of freight and insurance would be prohibitive for many small communities.

One unusual and highly original idea has been put to use by the Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond. Borrowing a leaf from the traveling bookmobiles, the museum decided to design a traveling art trailer that would be completely self-contained, able to arrive and depart from each community as a complete unit in itself without depending upon varying local facilities.

The staff of the Virginia museum put their heads together and came up with their first artmobile, a truck and trailer, the interior dimensions of which are 34 feet in length, 7 feet 10 inches in height, with the cab adding another 10 feet in length. The specially designed traveling gallery opens out when it is parked to cover an area 51 feet long and 22 feet wide. Side flaps are raised to reveal information charts on the sides of the trailer, and an information booth is added at the back. The artmobile is designed to be set up where an electrical supply of 220 volts to work the lights, air conditioning, humidity control and burglar alarms is available.

From the outside, Artmobile I looks like any big trailer truck. But when it is parked in a town square or schoolyard, it is transformed in about 2 hours into an independent museum on wheels. Out come the side flaps to create an awning on each side of the truck, and stairs are quickly set up on each side so that the spectators may enter by one door and leave by another, thereby relieving congestion. The information booth is attached to the rear of the truck, where material about the exhibit and the activities of the Virginia museum can be dispensed. Two loudspeakers attached to the outside front of the trailer supply music and announce the exhibit.

The interior is simply designed: an open space which lends itself to changing displays. Paintings may hang against the plain, fabric-covered walls, lit individually by spotlights from above; or pedestals and cases may be arranged in the interior to show scale models or displays of small sculptures or artifacts. Labels explain in simple language the history and source of the material, while a special loudspeaker system delivers a lecture on the exhibit.

On the back of the truck is a panel listing the names of those who have contributed toward making Artmobile I possible: Miller & Rhoads, the Richmond department store, which donated the trailer as a public service; the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, which has made great financial contributions toward initial operating costs, and still sponsors the artmobile's statewide tours; and several individuals.

Since 1953 the artmobile has visited every corner of the State of Virginia from border to border. Some of the exhibits it has conveyed in that time have been "The Little Dutch Masters," "Art in Ancient Egypt," "Italian Paintings of the Renaissance," and "Art Before Columbus." A new exhibit is installed every 3 years, at which time the artmobile repeats its travels throughout the State.

Before the artmobile arrives in any community, the museum in Richmond writes to the members of the local women's club, who act as hostesses for the exhibit. A folder is sent, giving instructions about the arrival, installation, and running of the artmobile; advance publicity is suggested, and filmstrips prepared by the Virginia museum are shown in the local schools. A member of the club is always on hand to explain the exhibits and to see to their protection. In addition, the driver of the artmobile is a trained curator, who not only sets up the exhibit but is qualified to discuss it and direct visitors. Upon completion of each showing, questionnaires are filled out by each club to give the museum an account of the trip and suggestions for the future.

The main function of Artmobile I has been to serve schools and clubs in smaller communities. But out-of-town chapters and affiliates of the museum are increasing and the demand for more and finer art displays has become overwhelming. The success of Artmobile I demanded that another exhibit trailer be built to serve the statewide confederation of chapters and affiliates. Once again the museum swung into action and, profiting by the experiences of Artmobile I, designed an even bigger and more elaborate trailer truck, Artmobile II. It was donated to the State by the Old Dominion Foundation.

The largest display vehicle in the world, Artmobile II is 54 feet long with cab, and over 10 feet wide. It requires a special permit and police escort to travel on Virginia roads. It is entirely automated, with its own power generator which allows it to be set up anywhere. The generator is housed in the truck, and from it air-conditioning, humidity controls, sound equipment, lighting, fire, and theft protection, and all other needs are met. The canopies, reception desk, information panels, lights, and so forth can be set up in less than 20 minutes by the driver who pushes buttons which activate hidden electric motors. The speed with which this can be done and the independence from power outlets means the Artmobile can be moved several times in 1 day. (Virginia now pays the operating expenses of both artmobiles, but the women's clubs still help to organize the visits of Artmobile I in each community it visits.)

Artmobile II brings three exhibitions a year to each chapter and affiliate of the museum. The museum sends its very finest art on these tours.

One of the most important aspects of the artmobiles is the regional art activities they inspire. The program recently undertaken by the northern Virginia chapter of the Virginia museum, at the time of the big artmobile's recent visit to Arlington, is an example of the scope of activities "generated" by the artmobile.

The artmobile was set up on the grounds of the America Legion post on Washington Boulevard. A festival already had been announced, to include music and dance groups, demonstrations by expert craftsmen in enameling, serigraphy, stitchery, pottery, and silhouette cutting, as well as an exhibit of art work by Potomac area artists.

The first evening included the formal unveiling of the artmobile exhibition, "Landscape Paintings, 1650–1960," with paintings from Claude Lorrain to Charles Sheeler. In addition an area art exhibit opened, which included work by 72 of the most outstanding Washington artists, installed in the main hall of the American Legion post. A further feature of the evening was a guitar recital by Thomas Hartman, who has been accepted for study this summer by Andres Segovia. The following evening saw a program of music and ballet, a string quartet from Arlington and a dance presentation by the McLean School of Ballet. On the next evening the Venus Orchestra played under the direction of John Ozolins. Meanwhile, afternoon demonstrations of work in various media were being held by such artists as Vally Possony in pottery and Edna Main in weaving, while artist Merry Bean made quick portrait sketches of visitors. The northern Virginia chapter estimates that 700 people attended the 3-day festival.

Each year as the two artmobiles make their tours of Virginia, more people are exposed to better art, and more children are given the opportunity to see the artistic legacies of the great ages they study in school. While it might be supposed that these rural tours would cut the number of visitors to the museum in Richmond, quite the opposite has proven to be the case. Stimulated by what they have seen in the artmobiles, more visitors are going to Richmond than ever before to study the museum's larger and more specialized collections.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking of cultural centers and the arts, I note that last week the distinguished

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were privileged to speak to the interns in Washington, D.C. The interns are young college students working in the executive branch of the Government, and in the legislative branch and judicial branch as well. There are several thousand of them. It is a marvelous experience for these young people, and I am sure it is very helpful to the agencies of Government. I am privileged to have some of the interns working in my office. I find them most helpful. They are bright, able, and conscientious. I trust that their experience will be of some assistance to them in their education.

In this connection, there is not a place in this city in which a large group can hold a meeting, outside of the Washington Coliseum and Constitution Hall. I hesitate to note that both of those are totally inadequate.

We have built an auditorium in practically every other country in the world. It seems to me we should build one here. Every country I have ever visited has had a marvelous auditorium, and all those countries have been recipients of generous aid from the United States. Perhaps we should offer an amendment to the foreign-aid bill to build a decent auditorium in Washington.

We are still fiddling around, talking about a National Cultural Center. It seems to me that somewhere along the line between the stadium, in which we lose ball games, and the Washington Coliseum, where one can lose his hat because of the sweep of the huge fans that run through it, and Constitution Hall, where one can almost lose an audience because of poor acoustics—somewhere between these extremes—we should be able to provide a decent auditorium for the Nation's Capital.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Minnesota has a good idea. If the Senator can persuade the Washington, D.C., contractors to take their pay in dinars, rupees, or zlotys, I might support his proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I might offer that suggestion. With the eloquence and persuasive ability of my good friend from Vermont we might be able to put it over.

This is my "gripe" morning. I think on Monday every red-blooded American ought to have an opportunity to complain about something. I thought I would use this day for that.

I have another complaint, while I am about it.

LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE RATES TO DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was at the Dulles International Airport the other night. That place is no beehive of activity. Anybody who is feeling under strain and tension, who would like to have a good rest, should go to Dulles Airport. It is about as quiet as outer space. It is marvelous out there. The only thing missing is a hotel. None has been built. One could pitch a tent. There is a vast area of space nearby.

It is a beautiful airport, particularly when one is flying over it and looking down at it, when he can see the lights on it, but no activity. But we must build for the future, I suppose.

The most interesting thing about Dulles Airport is that it is so far away from civilization. When a person gets out there he has to call long-distance.

We put up a fantastic sum of money needed to construct the airport, and for the mobile lounges, that give such a jolly, rich ride from the terminal out to someplace else, where a person boards a plane. That is a good idea; interesting, new, different, expensive. What did they cost? I believe the cost exceeded $250,000 each. But they may be an important innovation—time will tell. We must withhold judgment until Dulles gets some passengers.

The business of paying long-distance telephone tolls from Dulles Airport into Washington, D.C. is something else. I suppose one can absorb a $250,000 jolt, but the business of paying 25 cents to call home—merely to let a wife know that her husband has arrived; or to call an office and say, "Would you mind having somebody at least be alerted to the fact that I am back in town," when constituents are looking for some Member of Congress—is something else. It is necessary to call long distance to do that.

I thought that Dulles Airport was supposed to be the major airport to serve the Nation's Capital? If its purpose is to serve Herndon, Va., that will be all right, and then they can have long-distance telephone calls. If it is to be a sort of commuter airport, where Piper Cubs are to be brought in, to take off from runways and land on them with small planes, that will be all right, and long-distance rates will be fine to Washington.

But I think the Federal Communications Commission had "better get on the stick," as we say in my home area, and do something. I do not phone much, myself, but I have heard many other people complaining.

When I got back that night when I was charged for a long-distance call I wrote myself the following note:

> I was at Dulles Airport the other night and I find that all telephone calls from Dulles into the Washington metropolitan area are long-distance. Dulles Airport is a national airport to serve this metropolitan area.

I have to delete the next few words, because I was writing to myself, and I wanted to be more specific. I said:

> Why the telephone company has to have a long-distance toll on this is beyond me. Suggest that we call the Federal Communications Commission or write an appropriate letter to them protesting sharply. I want to do something about it. I understand there have been a host of complaints about it and nothing done so far.

I understand there have been many complaints. I took this matter up with the Federal Communications Commission. The processes of Government are slow and methodical. There is more protocol in these letters than there is in the entire State Department.

I wrote a short letter to Mr. E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I will make this a part of the RECORD. I noted what I thought was the problem. I said:

> I am writing to protest vigorously the policy of charging long-distance rates for a telephone call from Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia.

I pause to interpolate that it has been stated that George Washington threw a dollar across the Rappahannock River. I do not know whether he really could throw a dollar that far. We have thrown dollars farther than that lately.

Anyway, when George Washington threw the dollar across the river, if he did so, it was not more distant from Washington than the Chantilly region, where Dulles Airport is.

Now the telephone company says that the distance from here to Dulles Airport requires long-distance rates.

I said further:

> I do not know if the FCC is the appropriate body to which I should make this complaint. If not, I would appreciate your referring it to the proper Federal agency.
>
> Dulles Airport is a national airport designed to serve the Washington metropolitan area. It seems to me that some special arrangement will have to be worked out whereby calls from this airport are charged only local rates. Various safety factors constituted the reasons why Dulles Airport was located 25 miles in Virginia.

That was only one reason for building Dulles out in the country. I suppose there are others. Only a short distance away, at Baltimore, there is Friendship Airport. I ask the Presiding Officer (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair), Is that not correct?

There is a good airport at Friendship. I also said.

> It seems to me highly unfair that these factors should then be used by the telephone company as a basis for charging long-distance rates on what otherwise would be local calls.
>
> I would like to know what steps must be taken to correct this situation.

I want to make it clear in the RECORD that I am protesting in behalf of a large body of public citizens—the daring souls who use Dulles Airport.

I received a letter in reply, dated July 9. I sent my letter on June 24. That was pretty good.

If I had been that slow in replying to letters sent to me from constituents in Minnesota, I would have been a one-term Senator. I give prompt replies to letters. So does my esteemed colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Anyway, I received a letter in reply. The letter came from the Federal Communications Commission. In the letter it was stated:

> This refers to your letter of June 24, 1963—

There it is. The reference is to June 24, in the letter of July 9—

> relative to telephone rates between Dulles International Airport and the District of Columbia.

The letter went on to say:

> Public telephone service at Dulles Airport is furnished by the Piedmont Telephone Co., an independent (non-Bell) company. Serv-

ice to Washington is provided by means of interconnection of the facilities of the Piedmont Co. with those of the Chesapeake & Potomac Co. of Virginia (C. & P.).

We spend millions of dollars to build a highway to get out to the airport. It seems to me that if the Federal Government has the ability to spend millions to build a highway, someone in this Government might ascertain how to put a direct telephone line between Dulles Airport and the District of Columbia. That is supposed to be an international airport, but it is served by the Piedmont Telephone Co.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President—Piedmont Telephone Co. is a fine company. I am perfectly willing and content for that company to put in the line. I do not want to choose sides as between Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and the Piedmont Telephone Co. I want somebody to figure out how a telephone line can be installed so that in making a call one does not feel like he is talking to "Aunt Nellie" in Hackensack, Minn.

Twenty-five cents is not much money to talk for 4 minutes, but, on the other hand, it is not much time, knowing how Senators like to talk. Most Members of Congress would find themselves talking at least for the next 5 minutes or longer, and having to pay another quarter or more.

I have read from the letter for the RECORD. I had not expected to do that today, but this is a bad day. I had hoped to be enjoying myself by a lake in Minnesota. Who would not rather be there, but Senate business brought me to Washington. We have our responsibilities here. This is blue Monday; and decided to talk about this subject.

So long as we are putting in a four-lane pavement, wonder if a ditch could be dug alongside the road at the same time and a cable installed, in order to have direct phone service.

It seems to me that we ought to do several things to bring this town up to date. First, I wish the Washington Senators would win more ball games, but that is a local matter. They are doing much better recently, I understand. Win, lose, or draw, we have a beautiful stadium in which the team plays. Let us hope the team will keep improving as it has in the past weeks.

Secondly, the Washington Coliseum is the No. 1 Turkish bath. The acoustical properties of the arena are about as good as one would expect in talking down a salt mine. Boxing is one thing; speeches are another.

Then, we have Constitution Hall, in which a whole orchestra can be absorbed and one can never hear a note.

Somewhere between these extremes there ought to be a way to have a cultural center for Washington within the next 10 years. I invite people to see how it is done in West Berlin. The auditorium in any European city is beautiful. In Washington, D.C., it is nonexistent.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. First let me finish this thought about the telephone line. I am proud of our telephone systems. It is one of the greatest in the world. The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. gives remarkable service. So does the Bell System. So does General Telephone. All the telephone systems are excellent. All I ask is that an arrangement be evolved whereby, if Dulles is not to be merely a commuter airport, it will truly become an international airport. Let us make it a part of the community. If anyone wants to call it a country airport that became a little overgrown, that is all right with me. But if it is to be an international airport, let us make it a metropolitan airport.

If the Federal Communications Commission does not get that communication, I think it is slower than I suspected. The Federal Communications Commission can save a great deal of paper. It does not have to write to me and give me the answers. I knew the answers before I received them. I suggest that the Federal Communications Commission do something like what the Bureau of Public Roads has been able to do; namely, provide a road out to Dulles Airport, so that Members of Congress, friends, natives, and countrymen may save 25 cents.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I point out to the Senator from Minnesota that before Washington gets a cultural center, an adequate telephone line, or an auditorium, it must have a "fish palace" or aquarium. First things must come first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will not be dragged into that controversy. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that I should not make new enemies; I have enough old ones. I thank the Senator for any observations he wishes to make in his own right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the correspondence between the FCC and myself printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JULY 11, 1963.

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your helpful reply of July 9 to my earlier letter concerning telephone rates from Dulles International Airport to Metropolitan Washington.

I would, indeed, like to be kept informed as to the feasibility studies currently under way by the C. & P. Telephone Co. to determine whether Dulles can be incorporated in the Washington metropolitan exchange area. I also see the reasons behind your justification for the 25-cent rate charged for the 23-mile distance between Washington, D.C. and Dulles Airport. I might make only one point: there seems to me to be a distinction between a long distance call over 23 given miles and a call from Dulles Airport to Metropolitan Washington. Dulles, in effect, is an integral part of the Washington metropolitan area and it seems to me that some special considerations could be justified for persons making calls from the airport to the downtown city. I realize there are problems with this proposition, but I believe it warrants consideration.

I would appreciate being kept informed as to any developments in this area.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This refers to your letter of June 24, 1963, relative to telephone rates between Dulles International Airport and the District of Columbia.

Public telephone service at Dulles Airport is furnished by the Piedmont Telephone Co., an independent (non-Bell) company. Service to Washington is provided by means of interconnection of the facilities of the Piedmont Co. with those of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia (C. & P.). At present the rate for such service is $0.25 for a 4 minute station-to-station call. This rate is in accordance with the nationwide schedule of interstate long distance rates for calls between points 23 airline miles apart which is the mileage in the case of Washington, D.C., and Dulles. A reduction in this rate for calls between Washington and Dulles without a similar reduction in rates for all calls between points involving the same distance would raise a serious question of unlawful discrimination. A general reduction at this distance does not appear warranted in the light of known costs of providing service at such a distance.

However, consideration is being given by the C. & P. Co. to the possibility of including Dulles in the Washington metropolitan exchange area and thus providing service to Dulles on a local exchange basis. There are a number of problems connected with this approach which will have to be resolved. As mentioned above, public service at Dulles is provided by the Piedmont Co. and an agreement between that company and the C. & P. Co. must be reached as to the provision of joint local service. Moreover, there are a number of localities closer to Washington and more fully developed than the area around Dulles which do not now have metropolitan exchange area service and which must be considered in connection with any plans for extending such service to Dulles. Expansion of the metropolitan exchange area to encompass these localities as well as Dulles is estimated to cost several million dollars in additional plant investment.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. is presently engaged in an engineering and economic study of the feasibility of expanding the Washington metropolitan exchange area as mentioned above. We expect to hear from them regarding the results of the study in the near future. We shall be glad to keep you advised as to the developments in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

JUNE 24, 1963.

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to protest vigorously the policy of charging long distance rates for a telephone call from Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia. I do not know if the FCC is the appropriate body to which I should make this complaint. If not, I would appreciate your referring it to the proper Federal agency.

Dulles Airport is a national airport designed to serve the Washington metropolitan area. It seems to me that some special arrangement will have to be worked out whereby calls from this airport are charged only

local rates. Various safety factors constituted the reasons why Dulles Airport was located 25 miles in Virginia. It seems to me highly unfair that these factors should then be used by the telephone company as a basis for charging long distance rates on what otherwise would be local calls.

I would like to know what steps must be taken to correct this situation. I am prepared to introduce appropriate legislation if that is required.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

THE MANPOWER REVOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the May-June edition of Think magazine, published by International Business Machines, includes an article by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], entitled "Almost Everyone Wants to Work." It is an excellent summary of the progress made so far under the Manpower Development and Training Act, as well as several other Federal and State retraining programs.

As the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator RIBICOFF has an opportunity to experience at first hand the many educational challenges posed by automation and technological change. While he was Secretary he worked closely with those of us who were fighting for passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It was under his administration as Secretary that the program was launched.

This article is derived from that experience. It deserves to be read by every Member of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD.

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

ALMOST EVERYONE WANTS TO WORK

And almost no one likes to do made work. We all want—and need—an honest day's pay. More than that: We want and need the satisfaction of a job well done.

Unemployment, technological change, automation, the erosion of jobs—these are academic words if you have not suffered their consequences. Ralph McGill, in the Hartford Courant, reported their effect on an unhappy trucker who drove a cab part time, whenever he was laid off from his regular work. But lately, he had been driving a cab more and more. His regular job? Driving one of those big carriers that deliver new automobiles, mostly on long-haul trips.

"But then the railroads waked up and got into the act," he said. "They moved in so fast they have put a lot of us out of work. It looks like they are going to kill off a lot of the good jobs. About all that's left now is the short-haul stuff where the trains don't go. * * * I'm not bitter about it. I know these things happen. But it's just that you never expect it to hit you."

Here in the United States we have begun a massive nationwide effort to give stories like this one happier endings, and I'm proud to say that in this effort Connecticut has pioneered. As early as 1959, our State carried out successful retraining programs. Here are a few of the men and women who have recovered their wage-earning stride under these programs. Their backgrounds are varied; so are their ages and experience:

A sales clerk had worked for a lumber company 27 years when the firm went out of business. "None of the lumber companies around was looking for a sales clerk," he said. "But they tell me there's a demand for machine tool operators." So, with 15 other Naugatuck Valley men, he learned his new trade at a technical school in Bridgeport, and landed a job.

One of the top earners at a rolling mill in Bridgeport was displaced by automation. After 7 months without a job, he joined one of the first machine shop classes under the retraining program. With his newly acquired asset, he landed a job as a machinist learner. In half the normal time, he moved to the top skill group in the company and was soon a supervisor.

A young high school dropout floated from job to job for several years, and then, under the retraining program, finished a basic machine shop operator's course. He is now in full apprenticeship, working toward journeyman's status.

A talented young Negro girl in Norwalk wanted to go to college, but after finishing her college preparatory work and graduating from high school in 1960, she was unable to continue her education. She worked around—as a cafeteria kitchen helper, on an assembly job in an appliance shop, as a domestic day worker—but never had any solid training. Then she started retraining in an electronics assembly course in July 1962. Connecticut's Department of Labor recently got a letter from her employer saying that his new employee reached full proficiency in her work after only one week on the job. He credits her training for her excellent performance.

More and more of these happy-ending stories are now being told across the Nation. Last September, the Federal Government launched an ambitious program to improve the match between people like these Connecticut citizens and jobs. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, signed into law by President Kennedy in March 1962, we will try to retrain some 400,000 unemployed and underemployed workers.

This is only a fraction, of course, of the number of these workers. But we must begin to help them. For we have in the United States today an ironic and dangerous situation. We have jobs opening up at higher levels, and a record high number of jobholders—some 70 million employed men and women. But we also have, month after month, a chronically high level and rate of unemployment—over 5 percent.

Why is this so? Simply because the unemployed and underemployed often lack skills. (The unskilled worker accounts for only 5 percent of the entire working population, but makes up almost 20 percent of the long-term jobless.) So they often find it enormously difficult to enter the increasing ranks of the employed—at a time when rapid automation and technological change require both new and additional skills.

The trick, then, would be to find a way to help our labor force keep its skills up to date and learn new ones. This is what the Federal Government's Manpower Development and Training Act seeks to do. Under this act, our retraining program is off to a good start.

How does a man get into the program? To qualify for training in a new skill, or having an old skill brought up to date he applies to his local State employment service. He must be unemployed, or employed less than full time, or be a member of a farm family with an income of less than $1,200 a year. And he must be able to demonstrate the ability to acquire one of the skills needed in his area or State. Most important: No one is trained unless there is the possibility of a job at the end of the training period. This is a basic specification of the act.

A man is paid while he is in training if he is the unemployed head of a family or household with at least 3 years of gainful employment experience, or if he is over 19 but under 22 and doesn't qualify for the regular allowances. These allowances are equal to his State's average unemployment compensation. The average training cost throughout the country is $512 per trainee, and the average subsistence allowance paid each trainee is about $700.

Under the Manpower Act, the States and Territories may enter into agreements with two Federal departments—the Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare—to conduct manpower training programs, usually through their State vocational education agency. Almost all the States and territories have signed with both Departments and have programs underway.

Let's return to Connecticut, a leading example of the Nation's retraining efforts, for a look at retraining on the State level. Connecticut was the first State to initiate a major retraining program of its own, the first to sign the required agreements with the Federal Government, and already has a larger number of successful trainees who have graduated into employment.

The Connecticut retraining effort was begun under Gov. John Dempsey's direction. The pilot program, in Bridgeport, Conn., formulated the methods and philosophy which set a pattern for the State and for the Nation. Which workers could be effectively adapted to new skills and demands? How much retraining would be required? How could the public and private training facilities in the area best be utilized? These were the questions the Bridgeport program sought to answer.

The Connecticut State Employment Service, through its interviewing, testing, and counseling service, chose the candidates. They were men who not only needed new skills but who would also definitely benefit from retraining.

The first group of 15 unemployed workers completed a 6 weeks' training course as machine shop operators in June 1961. Its success attracted wide attention.

The program soon spread to other parts of the State. As in Bridgeport, no program was undertaken before a labor market survey determined the exact job needs of local industry. As in Bridgeport, the whole community—local industry and business as well as organized labor—had to participate actively in the retraining effort and be convinced of its value.

In other words, the basic philosophy of Connecticut retraining has been to make it meaningful in terms of the economic facts of life of each participating community. To be avoided: the training of workers for nonexistent jobs. To be reasonably assured: the placement of successful trainees upon graduation.

All the major communities in Connecticut have now taken part in the retraining effort, which has been expanded as a result of receiving some $1,050,000 under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act.

There has been outstanding, exciting success, like the program of the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp. in New London. Electric Boat urgently needed new skilled workers to help build nuclear submarines. But it could not recruit them from New London, which had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the State. It could, and did, proceed to recruit them from the nearby Danielson area, under the retraining program.

THEY TRAINED FOR NEW JOBS

Welders, pipefitters, shipfitters, electricians, machinists and sheet metalworkers—all have been trained under Electric Boat's mammoth retraining project. Forty-five courses in these trades have been completed; 613 of the 677 graduate trainees from the Danielson and Norwich-New London areas are now at work. Among them:

A Marine Corps veteran, the father of three, was a truckdriver in eastern Connecticut

when he was laid off because of a cutback. He found it tough to get work (he hadn't finished high school) until he joined a welding class under the retraining program. He landed a job at Electric Boat, and after 3 months with the company, got a special meritorious pay increase.

A 45-year-old World War II veteran had worked on and off as a laborer and was unemployed for 7 months until he qualified for pipefitter training at Electric Boat. His $1.95 an hour and scheduled raises are appreciated by his wife and three kids.

A Korean war veteran in his early thirties is also making good money as a pipefitter—after training. Married, and the father of two children, he had worked as the driver of a light delivery truck and had been out of work 6 months when he heard about retraining.

On a national scale, operations under the Manpower Retraining Act actually began in September 1962. Four and a half months later, 493 projects to retrain 18,000 people were underway. Men and women are now being trained for 115 occupations under the national retraining program. Over a quarter of them are in clerical or sales occupation courses, and most of these are learning to be stenographers and typists. Another 25 percent are training for metal working skills. Interestingly enough, about 10 percent are in health occupation courses, a field in which there are, of course, severe shortages.

In Connecticut, 111 courses have been successfully completed; 2,426 persons have participated in these courses, and 1,823 trainees have graduated. There are 11 courses now in progress, with 359 persons attending. Most of the courses have been of an industrial nature, like the ones which have prepared workers for skilled jobs at Electric Boat. But there have been a few in the commercial and service trades, like typing, and several courses are now going on to train cooks and waiters. Many of these, though they are for full time, 3-to-8-week periods, are orientation courses, and training is continued on the job in apprenticeship programs.

In Connecticut—and in the Nation—the retraining effort has had a catalytic effect. Private industry's interest in apprentice programs and other on-the-job training has been aroused. We are all more training conscious, and will become more so.

But we have a long way to go. We have many questions to answer. How, for example, do we train the so-called untrainables? How do we teach effective occupational skills to men and women who have never been really in the labor force? Can we provide real quality training for the inexperienced, unskilled and uneducated adults?

About 65 percent of the present trainees are high school graduates, and 80 percent of the high school graduate trainees have been placed in jobs. This shows quite clearly that we are, at the moment, only skimming the cream from the unemployed into the training program. For the millions of hard-core unemployed are often the very young high school dropouts, older workers, minority group members—the unskilled and uneducated.

Many are also "functional illiterates." They can read and write, but they cannot read well, understand simple arithmetic or grasp fundamental ideas. It has been estimated that, in one State, about half of the unemployed cannot be retrained and cannot get jobs because of such deficiencies. Yet a person with some degree of literacy stands a good chance of being selected for training. An illiterate does not.

Sweden, the Washington Post reported recently, has had outstanding success with its 10-year-old retraining program, and has a negligible unemployment rate of 1.5 percent against our present rate of about 5.5 percent. She retrains about 15,000 people a year out of her blue-collar work force of 1.5 million—about 1 percent. Her experts estimate that to be effective such a program must retrain at least 1 percent of the labor force each year to keep up with shifting patterns of occupational skills.

To equal this working record, we would have to retrain about half a million workers a year. And if we are to do this, we must get to the heart of the matter: the high school dropout and the older worker whose job has been erased by technology, or who simply never could hold a job because he can't use the fundamental three R's.

It stands to reason that we must get on with this job. We must enact the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, of which I am proud to be a sponsor, and which the Senate passed in April. And we must make President Kennedy's program to combat illiteracy—a key part of his education proposal—the law of the land.

Then unemployed youngsters would be included in our retraining effort—most important, those at loose ends in our big cities. And the older man or woman who never really had any education or training would have a constructive chance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is remarkable how great the political lag in Congress can be. For 30 years, dramatic alterations have transpired in the kind of a labor force our economy requires—changes brought about, in the main, by technological change. Yet only recently has there been sufficient awareness in Congress of the very profound challenge which these changes pose if we are to achieve, or even approximate, full employment.

Farsighted observers have long warned us of the many transitional difficulties working families will experience as we move further and further into an "innovating economy" based on a highly sophisticated technology. For several decades they have forecast what I have come to call the "manpower revolution," a revolution calling for substantial modification in the way we educate our citizens for work, in the way relations between labor and management are handled, in the role of Government in the labor market.

It was no great surprise to me to discover recently that among those who first perceived the changes looming on the horizon was my good friend, the prophetic senior Senator from Illinois. Over 30 years ago he was telling those in vocational training and guidance of the radical changes afoot in the labor market.

In October 1932, Prof. PAUL DOUGLAS of the University of Chicago, wrote an article for Vocational Guidance magazine which could stand side by side today with testimony the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower has received in recent weeks on the Nation's manpower problems. Only the figures would need changing, the examples updating.

Let us hope that another 30 years will not pass before the Congress and the Nation face up to the many challenges of the "manpower revolution."

I ask unanimous consent that Professor DOUGLAS' article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Vocational Guidance Magazine, October 1932]

TECHNICAL CHANGES AFFECTING VOCATIONAL CHOICE

(By PAUL DOUGLAS, professor of industrial relations, University of Chicago)

In the little New England village in which I grew up, the trade of carriage-making was thought by all of us to be peculiarly attractive. The work was interesting, the pay adequate and the future seemed assured. But when I last visited my former home, I found the carriage shop not only closed but actually in ruins, and learned that some of my former playmates had moved west to Detroit and to Flint to help build the new mechanism by which man travels on roads; namely, the automobile. That is one of the troubles in choosing the line of work one wishes to enter. It is hard enough at best, even in a static society, to choose the kind of job for which one wishes to prepare. But this choice is made even more difficult because the prospects of various industries and professions are so constantly changing. Our industrial world is full of change and as new inventions are made and human desires alter, the trades which were once prosperous decrease in importance and new ones rise. Old jobs decrease and in some cases disappear, and new ones emerge. Men and women who thought themselves placed for life find they must seek new posts. It is important, therefore, for those who stand on the threshold of earning their living to try to look into the future and see what is likely to happen to various occupations to which at the moment they are attracted.

When it is, of course, impossible to foresee the future in any very complete sense, we can perhaps obtain some idea of what is likely to happen by observing the changes which have occurred in the past. Fifty years ago nearly 44 percent, or three out of every seven Americans who worked for their living, were farmers. Today only approximately one out of every five is so engaged. In other words, improved machinery, better methods of farming, combined with the fact that city life and indoor work cause us to eat less than formerly, have made it possible for a farmer to feed twice as many people. Millions of farm boys and girls have therefore been either squeezed out of or released from farm work. There is every prospect that this trend will continue in the future. New machinery, notably the tractor plow and the combined reaper-thresher, is steadily increasing the amount of wheat and corn which a man can produce. Since our consumption does not keep pace with production because of the inelastic nature of the demand for farm products, it would seem almost certain that many more of our farm young people will be forced to seek their careers in the towns and cities. If and when a more or less mechanical cottonpicker is introduced in the South, there will be still more people who will be driven in from the soil, since King Cotton can then be handled with a much smaller staff of workers.

The increased use of oil, better methods of burning coal and generating power, combined with improvements in coal mining, have also decreased the number of miners who are needed and have caused tens of thousands of the younger miners to abandon their former work and hunt jobs elsewhere.

Within our towns and cities in turn, other great changes have been taking place. For decades a larger and larger proportion of our population went into the factories, but within the last 12 years the tide has turned very definitely in the other direction. Even before the depression of 1929, there were actually nearly 500,000 fewer wage earners in

our factories than there had been 10 years before, despite the fact that there were 16 million more people in the country. Electrical machinery, automobiles, and printing came, however, to employ more men, while cotton and woolen mills employed less. Pianos have wasted away as the phonograph and the radio have come in. Shoes have suffered as men ride more, while hosiery boomed with the advent of short skirts. Soft drinks, milk, and chocolate have increased in importance as the American production of beer and whisky has declined. The numbers employed on both the steam and the electric railroads, moreover, diminished as the automobile rose in importance. The Committee on Recent Economic Changes even went so far as to estimate that in 1927 there were more workers attached to bus and truck transportation than there were to the railroads, namely 1,900,000 as compared with 1,856,000.

Two sets of occupations, however, have been increasing during these past periods. The first is clerical work. In 1899, there was but one salaried worker in manufacturing for every 13 wage earners, while in 1927, there were slightly over two. The relative numbers in the office staffs had doubled, therefore, in the course of these 28 years. In addition to this, the numbers employed in banks and governmental offices, of course, have also greatly increased. Indeed, between 1910 and 1920, the total number of clerical workers rose from 1,700,000 to 3,100,000, an increase of over 80 percent. The second group of occupations which greatly expanded were the professions, trade, and the so-called service industries. There were more teachers, insurance agents, salespeople of all descriptions, and more in hotels and the amusement trades. In 1910 there were 3,400,000 persons in trade or 10.5 percent of the total, whereas by 1930 this number had increased to 7,500,000 or to 15.5 percent. Thus in the space of 20 years the proportion so employed rose from one-tenth to nearly one-sixth. Moreover, the numbers employed in the field of professional service advanced from 1,700,000 in 1910 to 3,400,000 in 1930, and this doubling in absolute numbers was equivalent to a relative advance of from 4.4 percent to 7 percent. The numbers employed in governmental service who were not listed in other occupations also showed an increase from 1.2 percent of the total in 1910 to 2.2 percent in 1930. Domestic and personal service which had declined from including 9.9 percent of all the workers in 1910, to 8.2 percent in 1920, rose during the last decade because of the expansion of hotels, etc., back to the 1910 figure. If, indeed, we take the total numbers employed in 1930 in trade, public service, professional service, and domestic and personal service, we have a grand total of approximately 17 million people. This is approximately 35 percent of the total number gainfully employed and is almost exactly equal to the total numbers in manufacturing, the building trades, railway transportation, and mining.

Some of these trends may undoubtedly be expected to continue in the future. As agriculture and manufacturing become more efficient so that a man can turn out a greatly increased product, we may expect a greater proportion of society's energies to be devoted to the production of services rather than of material commodities. We may, therefore, probably expect to find a smaller proportion, although not necessarily a smaller absolute number, employed in the so-called basic industries and a larger proportion in the less mechanized occupations where personal service is more important. If wholesale and retail trade could be made more efficient, however, apparently we could distribute the products of society with a much smaller proportion of energy than is now the case. If this improvement, therefore, comes about there will be a decline in the relative proportions absorbed in trade.

There is one possibility which I should like to throw out as a kind of challenge. We are frequently asked where the new industries will come from which will do for the coming generation what the automobile, the radio, and electric refrigeration did in taking up the slack for the decade which has just passed. There is certainly one great need which is evident to all those who know anything about our cities. That is the extraordinarily bad way in which our city workers are housed. For while our cities have been growing during the last 20 years on their outskirts they have been rotting at their centers until our unskilled and semiskilled urban workers are more poorly housed than are those of Northern and Western Europe. The east side of New York, the west side of Chicago, and the working class regions of Philadelphia are dreary, dismal places which were bad enough 15 years ago but which are far worse now. In order that even the skilled workers with family incomes of from $1,800 to $2,500 a year may be decently housed, it is necessary to cut rentals on new and decent buildings to $8 per month per room, or from $32 to $40 a month for 4- and 5-room apartments. If great improvements in building construction are made and restrictive practices are abandoned then it may be possible to reduce cost to somewhere near this figure. But there will still remain the great mass of unskilled and semiskilled workers whose wages of from 40 to 50 cents an hour, when deductions are made for illness, part-time and unemployment, can average hardly more than $1,000 to $1,200 a year, and who, therefore, cannot afford to pay $8 a month per room. To help this group, some type of better financing which may involve a governmental subsidy is needed if they are to be decently housed. If such improvements in construction and in financing are made, then we may look forward to many years of expanded activity in the building trades and in the factories which serve them. If these events do not happen, then building, which has constructed more office buildings and expensive apartment houses than are likely to be needed for some time, will decline. Its next great task is clearly the building of decent housing quarters for the workers of America. If it cannot solve that problem, then, in the words of Disraeli, "it will have a brilliant future behind it."

I have suggested one possibility for the future, and I should like to conclude with a reality that still is little realized. Sixty years ago every ambitious boy looked forward to the time when he would be master of his business and an independent proprietor in his own right. He read with hungry interest in the novels of Horatio Alger, so many in number yet so uniform in theme, of the country boy who came to the city and swept out his employer's office and who, by dint of never watching the clock, finally married his employer's daughter and came into proud possession of the business. Those days are largely over. Technical changes now demand the investment of so much capital that modern industry in manufacturing, transportation, and mining is carried on by big companies. So, to an increasing extent, is banking and trade. The large majority of American workers are wage earners or clerks and will always remain such. Thus in 1923, 38 percent of all the wage earners in manufacturing were employed in establishments with over 500 wage earners, and 71 percent in establishments with over 100. When we remember that a large company quite commonly has at least several, and in some cases many, establishments under its direction, the degree of concentration is even greater than is indicated by these figures. It is arithmetically impossible, under these conditions, for the mass to become individual proprietors and managers of the type celebrated by Horatio Alger and by some of the present-day magazines which exalt individual success.

It is but wisdom, therefore, that the younger generation should realize this as they enter industry, and should prepare themselves not only for the individualistic struggle for success in a changing world, but also for all the methods whereby the group of wage and salaried workers may cooperate to make their lives more truly satisfying. Vocational guidance properly conceived should not only prepare workers for better jobs than those which they or their parents now occupy, it should also prepare them for a more abounding life in that station in industry to which the exigencies of industry are likely to confine the vast majority. Sometime Americans will recognize that, as a whole, they cannot forever live above themselves, and will settle down to cooperate with other members of their class in building a more satisfactory life both within and without their working hours. Toward that end vocational guidance should aid.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which I have the honor to chair, is currently engaged in an extensive set of hearings probing the problems of the "manpower revolution" in depth. Our investigations have received added impetus from the current railroad labor dispute and from the Negro's battle for his rightful place in the labor market. Both railroad labor and the Negro are being hit by separate aspects of the manpower revolution; one by innovating technology which has drastically curtailed the need for certain classes of railroad workers, the other by society's failure to give him the educational and social assets necessary to compete in an economy of fewer and fewer pick-and-shovel jobs.

The subcommittee expects to have ready, by the end of this year, recommendations pertinent to these and other challenges posed by the "manpower revolution."

Meanwhile, the subcommittee intends to do its part in assuring that Congress and the Nation are fully aware of the task ahead if we are to achieve even a reasonable approximation of full employment.

It is heartening to see an increasing awareness of the problems of manpower and employment and unemployment in the press. For too long majority affluence has blinded us to the economic cancers of poverty and unemployment which still afflict the life of the Nation. These twin diseases must be treated now or the malignancy will inevitably spread. We can no longer allow the deceptive comforts of majority well-being to divert us from a proper diagnosis and treatment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the following articles:

"One Generation Is 'Lost,' but Must it Happen Again?" from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot.

"The Second Battle of Homestead," from the Reporter, July 18, 1963.

"The Point of No Return for Everybody," from Life, July 19, 1963.

"Expanding Apprenticeship for All Americans," from the American Federalist, July 1963.

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

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot]

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM: ONE GENERATION IS LOST, BUT MUST IT HAPPEN AGAIN?

The problem of unemployment is being overstated, Henry Ford argued in a recent interview.

He says:

(1) The Government's unemployed statistics are inflated because too many workers temporarily laid off are included in the totals.

(2) There are thousands of jobs going begging because people won't take them.

(3) Time will solve the problem of chronically depressed areas, with which Pennsylvania is especially plagued.

Government statistics on joblessness have been under fire for a long time, and an intensive special study now is in process by the Labor Department to see if changes are warranted. It is emphasized by critics that we consider workers unemployed in this country, such as part-time working wives and students, who never would be listed in other countries.

Edwin A. Lahey, of the Chicago Daily News Service, who interviewed Ford, asked about the middle-aged workers who have been automated out of jobs or who have been in a declining industry such as mining. "Ford is one of the few thoughtful industrial leaders to be frank about it," Lahey wrote, pointing out as many high Government officials do that we have neglected this problem so long that now nothing can be done about it. "These pockets will eventually disappear," Ford says.

His observation recalls the candid comment by Pennsylvania's David L. Lawrence, in the final days of his term as Governor, when he conceded in an interview with the Patriot-News that we unhappily have in Pennsylvania "a lost generation" of middle-aged steelworkers and aged or middle-aged miners for whom there never will be jobs comparable to the ones they used to have, if there will be any jobs for them at all. On top of their lack of skills in demand on the job market is their age.

This is the specter now haunting so many railroaders in the bitter dispute over work rules. The economic facts are on the side of the railroads, as independent fact-finding boards unanimously have established. But this leaves the very sore point, and one few public figures are willing to face openly and frankly:

There are, as Ford argues, "thousands and thousands of jobs going begging in this country because people won't take them."

What is involved here is the very human unwillingness of a man to downgrade himself when the good job which he has known for so long suddenly is wiped out. Newsman Lahey posed this question:

"What will thousands of diesel firemen do when someone finally decides they've had it?"

The railroaders will have a lot of company as other industries continue to automate and improve their production processes. Before the 1960's end, a Labor Department survey forecasts, 24 million jobs will have been affected by technological change. That's an average of 200,000 jobs a month, 2.4 million jobs every year.

It is little wonder that many Americans are urging a much more elaborate program of retraining of idled workers than now exists.

It is little wonder that programs such as Pennsylvania's PIDA and the Federal ARA for depressed areas hold such human appeal on top of their stark economic necessity.

And the need to give our youth far better educational opportunities, especially opening up training for many of them in technical skills, calls for a lot more effort than so far has been forthcoming—in Harrisburg and at Washington. One "lost generation" a century should be enough.

[From the Reporter, July 18, 1963]

THE SECOND BATTLE OF HOMESTEAD

(By Joseph G. Colangelo, Jr.)

Across the Monongahela River, 7 miles around a bend from downtown Pittsburgh's revitalized "Golden Triangle," lies the town of Homestead. Its most outstanding feature, now as always, is a steel mill—an agglomeration of huge iron sheds stretched out in a mile-long arc parallel to the riverbank.

Seventy-one years ago, the millworkers in this town fought a brief but violent battle when Carnegie Steel Corp.'s Henry Clay Frick attempted to make the mill safe for strikebreakers by sending in armed Pinkerton agents. Instead of submitting as they had in the past, the millhands literally took over the town and defeated the Pinkertons in a bloody engagement that stretched into the night on July 6, 1892.

Today, the town library is named after Carnegie, a patch of unkempt foliage on the hill is called Frick Park, and the millhands are up against a different kind of enemy—the forces of technological advance, economic readjustment, and a declining national growth rate. The issue is job security and the weapons are negotiation, arbitration, and the vagaries of contract. The recent steel settlement, for example, granting a 13-week vacation every 5 years to long-term employees, attempts to spread the work rather than raise the pay.

The superintendent of the Homestead mill is Robert McClure, who started in the steel industry as a laborer during the unionizing drives of the depression but who never joined the union and never wanted to. McClure will not give out figures on how many men have been laid off in his plant. The United States Steel Corp., heir to the Carnegie holdings, will not permit it for competitive reasons.

What McClure will say is that "the Homestead mill isn't new, but we've kept the equipment modernized and we've got a good competitive situation. We haven't been full recently, but we've been a damn sight closer to maintaining a respectable operating level than a lot of other mills in the area." That respectable level, he told me, is between 55 and 65 percent of capacity.

Capacity, however, means steel, not people. Homestead has 25 open-hearth furnaces gathered into 2 different shops, called OH–4 and OH–5. The former, which has 14 open hearths each capable of turning out 150 tons of metal three times a day, has been open only once since July 1960. Of the 11 furnaces in OH–5, only 7 to 9 operate with any regularity. Each of these can produce 300 tons of steel three times a day. Since it takes as many men to operate a single 150-ton furnace as it does a 300-ton furnace, less than half the men are needed to maintain 55 percent of capacity in the open-hearth division. This explains the good competitive situation. But if increased demand should require United States Steel to relight the 14 furnaces of OH–4, it would raise the average cost per unit of steel produced by the Homestead mill.

Elsewhere in the plant the pattern is similar. In one rolling mill the work force has gone from 1,700 to 1,200. In another, the drop has been from 1,500 to 1,000. There were 1,000 men in the plant's forge 5 years ago; there are 650 now. In all, there are only 6,000 union men at work in the mill today as compared with 9,700 5 years ago and 10,400 10 years ago. Nor are all of the men left on the job working full time. Some are only scheduled 4 days a week. Others are on a week, off a week. Occasionally a section of the mill will shut down early in a shift for lack of orders to be processed.

The possibility—or the hope—that some of the layoffs may be only seasonal or temporary keeps many of the workers from facing up to the realities of their situation. Just between April and June of 1962, for example, more than a thousand men were let go in a temporary cutback. "If we get even 800 back," I was told by Barney Shields, a member of the plant grievance committee, "we'll be lucky. When things level off, they never level off where they were before."

The steelworkers' contract specifies that a man's employment is not officially terminated until he is on layoff continuously for 2 years. Even then he has the option of collecting his severance pay or continuing his layoff status for another 3 years in the hope that he will be called back. Each time a man is rehired, however, even if for only a day or two, he begins another 24-month waiting period.

Unlike in the old days, when men were laid off without regard to rank or length of service, a steelworker today is almost always able to calculate when his turn will come. It is fixed by the date he was hired. "Steelworkers," according to Shields, "talk about only two things—sex and seniority." Seniority determines who will be laid off, who will be rehired, and who, instead of being laid off, can qualify for a lower paying spot in the labor pool.

A certain reserve of men is likely to be needed around any mill on a regular basis to perform odd chores. Back in 1955, Local Union 1397, the Homestead local of USW, set up the first permanent labor reserve staffed by senior men laid off their normal jobs. (The international union has since adopted the system throughout the industry.) But things are so tight in Homestead today that unless a man was hired before March 4, 1942, he can't even qualify for the labor pool.

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

What, in addition to a lack of steel orders, is causing this more or less steady decline at the mill? Shields blames the permanent cutbacks on technological advance, cost cutting, and "contracting out." Automation comes last.

As recently as 7 years ago, Shields informed me, it took almost 14 hours to run a 150-ton "heat" of steel through a Homestead furnace. Today, with oxygen injected into the furnace to increase temperatures and with better materials handling, twice that amount can be produced in half the time. Recently United States Steel has announced that it will install in its nearby Duquesne works two "oxygen converter" furnaces that can whip out a heat of steel in as little as 52 minutes. Paul Morrow, superintendent of the open-hearth division at Homestead, has said that the blueprints are in his top drawer if the company should ever decide to do the same at his mill. Two of these furnaces could produce as much steel as the 14 unused open hearths in OH–4. And it takes as many men to operate one open hearth as it does to operate one oxygen converter.

Contracting out has been a particularly difficult problem at Homestead, although it is common to most of the steel industry. The issue is simply this: outsiders have been getting jobs in the mill that the Homestead millhands want. These outsiders are not scabs or strikebreakers; they are union members of the construction and building trades who work for outside contractors hired by United States Steel.

Local Union 1397 claims that its men should be hired for these jobs. Superintendent McClure admits that they are capable—"a damn sight better, in fact"—but protests that the contracts were let in boom times when the local men weren't available, that

his maintenance division isn't equipped to do new construction, and that the outside contractors can do some of the work more cheaply. Such explanations offer little consolation to the group of boilermakers, for example, who were standing in line for their unemployment checks recently at union hall. Through a window that faced the plant, the men could see boilermakers from another union at work under contract putting a patch on one of the open hearths, a job they would normally do. "They came to me and asked me what I was going to do about it," Shields told me. "I told them I couldn't do anything about it, which I can't. We'd already arbitrated this thing and lost."

At the end of April 1962, when the wholesale temporary layoffs began, the men tried to do something about it themselves. They held a dues checkoff, and stopped every workman entering the mill gate, asking to see his union card, ostensibly to determine whether his U.S.W. membership was paid up. Anyone without U.S.W. credentials was kept out. At one point, Shields ran across a handful of steelworkers venting their rage on another unpopular figure in the current Homestead struggle—foreign cars. The men were about to dump a Volkswagen on the railroad tracks beside the plant. Shields stopped them, because for one thing, the foreman was still in the car. When the skirmish ended, the rules of modern industrial warfare prevailed and the problem of contracting out was referred to a labor-management committee.

As for automation, Superintendent McClure has said flatly, "Anybody who thinks he's going to run a steel mill with pushbuttons is out of his mind." United States Steel already has had one unfortunate experience with automated rolling mills at the Duquesne works. The management there found that every time a slight modification was introduced in the automated rolling procedures, some 14,000 punchcards had to be altered. Moreover, an experienced rolling machine operator could turn out more steel in less time. Duquesne has now gone back to manual operation.

But smaller operations have been automated quite successfully. The Homestead chemical laboratory is an example. Before the Second World War, analysis of finished steel to determine whether it met customers' specifications was done by a wet chemical process that required the services of 132 men. In 1949, the mill installed spectographs that speeded up operations considerably, but an increase in steel orders and the need for experienced personnel to interpret data from the machines kept the work force at the existing level. Then a "Quantometer," a device that made its own interpretations but missed a few of the elements, was put in and the chem lab force dropped from 132 to 65. Three years ago, the company installed a "Quanavac," which reads all elements, and now only 36 men are left.

Despite the layoffs, Homestead doesn't look depressed. "Sure there may be a couple of thousand men out of work," a local newspaper reporter remarked, "but there are 7,000 or 8,000 still employed. And that's a hell of a lot of people pouring out onto the street at lunch hour in a town this size."

Then men out of work are protected from immediate desperation by State unemployment compensation and industry supported supplemental unemployment benefits. When this is used up, usually in 32 weeks, a worker can, if necessary, get welfare payments, which carry with them a lien on the man's home, if he is lucky enough to own one.

Today in the Homestead area there are 550 public assistance cases and 5,000 to 6,000 men receiving unemployment compensation. On the average, 200 to 250 of the unemployment-compensation claims run out every month, but perhaps the most dramatic statistic is the drop in population. Since 1950, a fourth of Homestead's people have moved out.

Some of those who lost their jobs but stayed on have found other work, but most companies are reluctant to hire men still technically on layoff status at Homestead. They know that for the most part the men will return to their old jobs and former seniority if the mill ever gets back to full production.

One laid-off worker, Gene Zuger, tried to escape this trap. With his brother-in-law, he decided in August 1961, to drive out to Valparaiso, Ind., where the National Steel Corp. had just opened a new mill. Another brother-in-law, also out of work, had just landed a job there. They left at noon. At 3 p.m., after months without a word from the company, the mill telephoned his home to ask if he could come in the next morning. His wife took the message and got in touch with her husband in Valparaiso late that evening. Zuger hitchhiked back that night to Homestead. He worked 9 days, and was laid off again. When he returned to Valparaiso, all the available openings were filled. The brother-in-law who was fortunate enough not to be called back has been employed steadily at the Indiana mill ever since. The Zugers, who have 6 children, are now living on $121.30 every 2 weeks from the county welfare department. To them the second battle of Homestead, which is actually a kind of siege, is no less painful than the first was to the earlier steelworkers, who not only won their fight but were able to confront the enemy directly.

[From Life magazine, July 19, 1963]

THE POINT OF NO RETURN FOR EVERYBODY

An executive in an automated plant was describing a machinist's new job. "All he has to do," he explained, "is press the button to start the machine and then monitor it. All he has to know is what his machine looks like so he can find it when he comes to work."

There are 426 things that can go wrong with William Jensen's machine. Yet, says Jensen, "the job gets boring. You spend most of your time loading it, rewinding the tape, and sometimes you spend 45 minutes just watching it."

But Frank Martoglio, who started out 46 years ago as an 18-year-old apprentice machinist and now works on the machine, says, "It's hard to explain but I take great pride in the job. It makes me feel I'm part of the future. But the machine is the brain."

Neither Jensen nor Martoglio nor thousands like them have any complaint about automation. It has not taken their livelihood. In fact it has given them better-paying, less arduous—if less interesting—jobs. But in places like the coal mine region of Kentucky, the jobs vanish as small mines close one by one. They are unable to compete with the bigger mines which have become automated with the consent and, even more, the prodding of the United Mine Workers. The blazing-eyed Kentucky miner can only howl his resentment in the union hall. "I can't get a job nowhere," shouts Jason Combs, 54 and hopeless. "Boy, it kills me. It burns me up."

I HAD TO FORGET MY SENIORITY AND START ALL OVER AGAIN

When the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. installed automatic glass-cutting machines in its Ford City, Pa. plant last year, Nicola Yanoff, a glass cutter with 11 years' seniority, became a statistic in the lists of U.S. unemployed. Yanoff was 43 but, he decided, "I'd better forget my seniority and start all over again." With 14 others he joined up for a 26-week course at Ford City High School set up under the Federal Manpower Development and Retraining Act. He studied chemistry, physics and mathematics, aiming for an inspection job in some plant.

"It wasn't easy to go back to school," he recalls, "but my wife made me stick it out." The Yanoffs, with four children, got by on a $33-per-week Federal retraining allowance, $21-per-month service pension and $15-per-month's work of free U.S. surplus food.

When Nicola Yanoff graduated from retraining, Pittsburgh Plate Glass took him back as a quality control technician—a better job. "Age wasn't a consideration," says Yanoff, marveling at his luck while sympathizing with 3,200 of his neighbors still unemployed.

UNEMPLOYED HUSBAND

Automation hit Walter W. Peterson, of San Diego, Calif., last February on the same day he received a pin from the Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp., in recognition of 20 years' service. As a tool and diemaker, a member of the International Association of Machinists Local 1125, he was highly skilled and proud of it. But Convair, his bosses told him, was not doing well in the commercial aircraft field and was regearing toward missiles. Also, new types of automatic machinery could make tools and dies better than he.

Peterson was 45, married, with three children. He owned his own comfortable home on a hill overlooking the Pacific, had two cars, and over the years he had built up $10,000 in his savings account. Now he had to go home and tell his wife that for all their hard work and thrift they were in trouble. He walked through the doorway and said, "Well, you're now looking at an unemployed husband."

Stunned by unemployment, Walter Peterson putters around his garden. "Many mornings I wake up and just decide to lie there," he says. "Finally I decide, 'Well, I might as well start the day.'"

Mrs. Peterson has a long, long breakfast in the kitchen with her husband. "You know," she says, "you never really think about the unemployment situation until you're a part of it. You may say, 'Isn't it awful' but you don't really worry about it. Somehow unemployment doesn't seem very real. Then when it happens to you, it's all of a sudden very real."

Mrs. Peterson cleans up before she heads out for her $1.40 an hour, 4-hour-a-day job at a school cafeteria. Her husband will make the rounds of plants and union hall seeking a job.

BIG LABOR HUNTS FOR THE HARD ANSWERS

(By Keith Wheeler)

Recently John I. Snyder, Jr., a conscientious man of 54, sat in the darkened Park Avenue boardroom of U.S. Industries Inc. in New York City watching his mindless monsters at work. They both pleased and troubled him. Snyder is chairman of the board of USI, whose chief pursuit is the design of automated production machines.

On a movie screen, two of USI's mechanical gremlins were showing what they can do. Now and then a pair of flesh and blood hands would appear and demonstrate that almost anything that hands born of woman can do the gremlins can do better, faster, more cheaply.

Snyder knows well that his contraptions—and their bloodless brothers now being turned out by about 200 American firms—already have provoked crises in the human hives of organized American labor. But extension of this thought goes beyond the problems of labor unions—and worries him even more. It is the idea that, unless society summons the will and imagination to alter itself to the rhythms of a new kind of technology, his kids and yours and mine may grow up with nothing much to do but loaf.

Snyder's worry is not new and his is by no means the only mind wrestling with it. But

it is too big a problem for the imagination to take a firm grip on it. A few weeks ago in a labor-industry-Government seminar on what to do about automation, labor-management relations counsel John F. O'Donnell from Columbia University thought the conference was shot through with unreality.

"We now have 68.1 million people working and 4 million out of work," he said. "But if the Labor Department's own 5-year projections are correct and if you convert percentages into people, we'll have only 64 million working and 14.6 million crying for work in 1968."

However, there is more than one way to skin a statistic. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently held a 2-day meeting with the country's labor press editors in Washington. During the discussions, Robert Myers, a department statistician, used the same general statistical projections to estimate that our unemployment will have increased by only 1.6 million by 1967.

Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning suggested a less sanguine prospect by calculating that in the 1960's the economy must provide 36.5 million new jobs to stay even. Population growth, he said, will produce 12.5 million new humans in the work force, while at the same time the increase of productivity per worker—largely as a result of automation—will eliminate 24 million jobs in this decade. These are the rough dimensions of the problem and worthy of all the attention they can get.

Nobody—not even the labor unions most directly affected—asserts that automation, by itself, is an evil. The people, the economy, the Nation already reap enormous benefits from the technological explosion. It provides more goods and services of higher quality at lower prices. The highly automated telephone industry, for example, has tripled its volume of traffic in 23 years; were it not for automation, the phone companies alone would now need the services of nearly all the working women in the country as operators to handle their increased business load. Also, as its momentum gathers, automation creates new industries of its own—and with them, new jobs of its own. Importantly, it helps the Nation maintain a competitive position in world markets.

But while automation promises a fuller life for most people some day—if it can be understood and controlled—it offers no comfort to human beings caught right now in the undertow of the technological tide. This article will show how the machines lie somewhere near the core of today's surprising wave of anger against American labor unions. It will suggest that, at the same time, the machines have begun to force a subtle but healthful change in the traditional, hidebound hostility between labor and capital. It will outline some of the more imaginative and fruitful, but so far inadequate, efforts to save man from his own creations.

But first, a look at two of the machines and their maker. One of John Snyder's performers, called by the glamorless title of vibratory bowl feeder, is a lustrous disk with a spiral ramp rising at the edge. It can be loaded with a helter-skelter of things—erasers, screws, metal parts. The disk appears to be rotating but is not; the illusion is caused by an invisible vibration which sets the load into a sedate, outward trending waltz until, one by one, the pieces leave the dance floor and move up the ramp. Crisis awaits them at the top: Those which arrive right side up and front end to are allowed to pass; but any maverick which comes upside down, backward, topsy-turvy, or is in any way defective or unlike its fellows is contemptuously flicked back to try again.

The other machine, with the sexier name of TransfeRobot, is a swinging arm and hand, but infinitely superior to any human arm or hand. It is absolutely tireless. Whatever it picks up and puts down it always picks up and puts down in the same place and attitude to within .002 of an inch.

Alone or in combinations, the disc and arm sort things or take things from one place to another or, getting more complicated, bring together and assemble the parts of complex electrical switches or, getting delicate, sort, select and pack boxes of chocolates. The hand can exert any kind or degree of force, from that of a vise to something more tender than a lover's caress, and can be adapted to use mechanical fingers, electromagnets or, for such oozy stuff as a chocolate cream, a gentle vacuum.

"So far," Snyder says, "we have not been able to find any material or any shape or any size it can't handle.

How many human hands might these machines replace?

"Depends on the job and depends on how far you want to carry the process," Snyder says. "The number could be close to infinite. We built an automated stamping line for Nissan Motors in Japan. It has six presses with TransfeRobot-type machines to take the stuff out of one press and feed it to the next. One man watches raw sheet metal go in and one more watches finished fenders come out. It replaces, oh, maybe 20 men altogether. But that's not all; you could extend the process right up to bolting the fender to a car. Even considering how cheap labor is in Japan, the thing saves money."

What, then, does all this mean to the muscles and hearts and minds of men who not only need to work in order to live but also, by eons of instinct, have been conditioned to understand that they need work for the sustenance of their souls?

"It means they are out of work," Snyder says. "Optimists like to compare this to the industrial revolution—but the analogy is wrong. People got hurt then because we were breaking out of an agrarian society to build an industrial society. Today we live in an industrial society, but with these new tools we are obsoleting not only our conventional machines but modern men as well. The industrial revolution created jobs. Now we're using sophisticated machines to destroy jobs."

When you destroy the job, do you also destroy the man?

"Very likely. Take yourself. Say you're sent home and there's nothing to do and no prospect of anything to do. How long does it take you to go crazy? A month, a week, a day, or just 15 minutes? Probably the last."

Well, then, why are we doing it?

"Because we must. It can't be stopped. They tried it in the industrial revolution. They even legislated against the powered spindle—but it didn't work because England had to export. It won't work today for the same reason. We're living in a competitive world."

All right, it's a competitive world. But what happens in the paradox of a world competing to make more things better and cheaper for the use of man while, simultaneously, the facts of competition begin to eliminate the need for man's muscles and, by the same token, threaten to eliminate his paycheck as a customer for the things? Obviously the first to ram into the question head on are organized labor and industry. But the question is a cosmic one and the ultimate answer cannot yet even be sensed.

Still, under the unprecedented pressures of the new technology, a few wondrous things have come to pass. The most significant came on that traditionally bloody battleground between the steelworkers and the industry. There, just a month ago, labor and management negotiated an amicable settlement guaranteeing at least 2 years of labor peace. The agreement's chief feature was one designed to spread the diminishing work by giving senior employees a 13-week vacation every 5 years. The agreement, which includes no wage increase as such, was worked out by the labor-management human relations committee, which was created to ease the agonies of automation and salve the frictions of strike deadlines by keeping the two sides in continuous contact.

This was the first big payoff in what one observer describes as "a feeling that some parts of both labor and capital are trying to find a new place to stand. There's a small but noticeable trend away from the old idea of 'the hell with him, he's my enemy,' and toward the hope that maybe they can work it out as partners."

Here and there, the groping for sensible answers—though it sometimes hurts—results in tangible action. To save King Coal from fading into a dethroned memory, the United Mine Workers cooperates with management to automate the mines. American Motors shatters industry precedent by offering its employees a profit-sharing plan. One aristocratic union, New York Local No. 1 of the Amalgamated Lithographers, led by its energetic and unorthodox president, Edward Swayduck, violates all union tradition by paying for full-page ads denouncing featherbedding and opting for all the automation the industry can devise. In partnership with one employer, Kaiser, the steelworkers actually agree to go whole hog for ultra-advanced technology and split whatever it saves. The Chicago local of the Flat Janitors Union digs its treasury out of the mattress and risks it all on a creative project designed to make more jobs for its members.

But these are the brilliant exceptions. For the most part, both management and labor still stand toe to toe and ready to slug it out. Now, however, there is a mighty difference. Thirty years ago labor marched in the battle for wages and hours and for the right to organize. Today the machines are marching against the blue-collar working man and the battle is elemental—the struggle for survival.

The unfortunate result is that lately organized labor has been causing and catching more hell than it has for a generation. The most compelling force in the railroad crisis has been the battle to save almost all of an entire occupation—the firemen—from extinction. In their grim efforts to hang on somehow, the firemen are denounced for "featherbedding," hanging around the neck of the economy like a decaying albatross. They are by no means alone; uncounted thousands of other American workers whose jobs have been eliminated by improved technology still cling to them, although their actual usefulness has become highly debatable.

The struggle to hang on in the face of widening automation was behind the costly and resentment-breeding newspaper stoppages in Cleveland and New York and the east and gulf coasts' longshoremen's strike.

To the printers the real enemy was punched or electronic tape which, when fed to the keyboards of modern line-casting machines, can reduce the composing room work force by two-thirds; so the printers fought the tape for use in setting such material as stock market reports. The beasts opposing the longshoremen were called by the perplexing new names of prepalletizing, containerizing or unitizing—all modern cargo-handling techniques which are estimated to have reduced the longshoreman's work by about 10 percent in the last 5 years.

The trouble was that these strikes tramped on a lot of more or less innocent toes. It has been estimated that the strike and lockout of 3,000 New York printers threw at least 20,000 out of work in the newspaper industry and cost the city in general at least $250 million in business.

The strike turned up such a blast of temper that even President Kennedy condemned the stoppage as "long past the point of public toleration."

The strike by 70,000 longshoremen crippled vital shipping along half the Nation's coasts and racked up costs in lost work and the breakdown of commerce that amounted to $975 million.

President Kennedy's concern about such burdens on the economy brought the reactivation last May of a long-dormant labor-management committee to fend off strikes affecting the public interest. Meanwhile, as the unions get roundly damned as barefaced pickpockets of the Nation, none of organized labor's present goals escapes suspicion. George Meany's announcement that the AFL-CIO will drive for a shorter workweek fetches a howl of condemnation to the effect that, in blind greed, labor demands ever more for doing ever less.

Making a survival drive for countrywide and industrywide contracts, the unions stand charged as ruthless monopolists—and there is talk of antitrust legislation. Actually, however, the strength of organized labor has been waning for at least 10 years, rapidly in the last 5. In 1955, when at last the A.F.L. and C.I.O. reached the altar in a loveless marriage of convenience, President Meany pledged that the couple would then go out and "organize the unorganized." Eight years have passed but the only major union to pick up significant new membership has been Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters—who are not even recognized as respectable in-laws. Total union membership in the United States today is about 18 million—almost exactly where it was in 1955 when, of course, the population was smaller. The grand total of members is only one fourth of today's civilian work force of 72 million-plus.

Various excuses are advanced for the dwindling of the ranks. It is said that the crusading fervor of the '30s and '40s has faded into fat-cat complacency. Some say that labor's reputation is too hoary and heavy-handed to win acceptance by the growing white-collar class. It is charged, and justifiably, that jealous unions wrangle so over who is going to organize whom that nobody gets organized. A company-to-union liaison officer in General Electric's big Schenectady, N.Y. plant believes that "unions have become an anachronism to workers. In this plant the average guy makes about $138 a week, has two cars, a house, and a kid in college."

While such opulence may still be true of skilled workmen—though that second auto would seem hard to come by on $138 a week—it is anything but true of the area where machines are hitting first and hardest. This is on the production lines of basic manufacturing, traditionally the largest sector of the economy. Since 1957, the Labor Department reported in a recent manpower survey, 775,000 actual production jobs have been wiped out; automation was cited as a major contributing villain to this destruction. As individual unions, the heaviest sufferers so far have been the auto workers, down 168,000 members since 1953, despite the glittering fact that 1963 is that industry's all-time Golconda; the steelworkers, down 200,000 since 1956; the mine workers, down 500,000 working miners since 1945; all railroad workers down 670,000 since 1947. The erosion of production jobs of all kinds became clear by 1956 when, for the first time, white-collar workers began to outnumber blue collars in America.

The revolution has brought the coinage of new terms to describe people who have no work. They are called "the unhired." These displaced or unplaced humans represent not only despair for themselves but, for organized labor, a painful and ironic loss of both manpower and revenue.

"It may sound cynical but a lot of these people probably are not ever going to be hired at all or hired again," says a veteran labor observer. "Practically speaking, as long as a man has no work and so is not a factor in the economy, how can you organize him? Marginal workers can never bring back in dues what it costs to organize them. Unions, too, must think about cost accounting."

In the superheated climate of public resentment, the unions are accused of being just too disgustingly rich. But until very recently few outsiders could even guess what any one union might be worth. The first opportunity for the public to take a worthwhile peek into the counting houses of labor came with passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which required unions to file annual financial statements.

The first batch of reports for 1961 is still being digested by the Department of Labor, but the Department has recently disclosed that labor is far less affluent than supposed. The report fixed the total of wholly owned union wealth at about $1.5 billion, which comes to something less than $100 each for every union member in the country. The Department's list of the 10 wealthiest unions included: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, $111 million; United Mine Workers, $110 million; Ladies Garment Workers, $44 million; Teamsters, $38 million; Steel Workers, $31.5 million; Auto Workers, $30.7 million; Locomotive Firemen, $29.3 million; Bricklayers, $26.3 million; Machinists, $22.9 million; Hod Carriers, $21.3 million. But some were worse than broke—notably the International Longshoremen, which reported itself $694,000 in the hole.

The "richest" list provoked indignant denial from the Electrical Workers' president, Gordon Freeman. He declared that the listed total included $102 million which actually belonged to the union's pension and death benefit fund. He pointed out that even the entire reported total wealth of all unions, $1.5 billion, would still be peanuts compared, say, to the $24.6 billion assets at A.T. & T.

Calculation of labor's wealth has frequently been distorted by this confusion between union-held treasure and the very much larger capital accumulations in the Nation's pension and welfare funds. The Labor Department has disclosed that 120,510 such funds held assets of $52.2 billion at the close of 1960 and were then growing at a rate of $4.5 billion a year. Most such funds are trusteed, however, and only 1 percent are exclusively controlled by union officers. Moreover, the workers who are designated as the eventual beneficiaries of the funds include far more nonunion than union employees, up to and including corporation presidents.

It is fortunate that such cushions for the jolt of economic dislocation do exist; it seems likely that something similar eventually will have to be devised to protect a lot more humanity. Thus far the foremost victims of automation have been the most helpless to fight back. They are the very young looking for a first job, especially school dropouts who possess neither training, experience nor seniority; the elderly, who are ill equipped or temperamentally unwilling to have their lives uprooted; and the nonfavored minorities, Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The plight of the minorities, indeed, adds a powerful surge to this year's tides of racial strife. Hammering at the door for social and educational equality, the Negroes are ready to fight, and fight now, for equality in jobs and access to them. Here again the unions, particularly the building-trades unions which have long been all but closed to Negroes, stand accused.

But it is clear that automation is eliminating not only the unskilled or semiskilled production worker. Indeed, it already has penetrated beyond unions as such, is reaching deep into the white-collar class and, as it develops, seem unlikely to respect anybody. For example, the machines have taken much more than a bridgehead in the communications industry—as anyone knows who ever dialed a Los Angeles telephone number direct from New York or Chicago without the aid of a human operator.

It was once optimistically believed that the still growing service industries might soak up the extra labor supply. But the army of mechanical hands ready to perform countless service functions is expanding too fast to be ignored. We are already accustomed to automatic elevators, cigarette machines, drink and candy vendors, laundromats, machines that collect tolls or make change. It does not often come to mind that each gets rid of one or more human beings.

Not long ago Macy's, New York, even tried out a machine that sold 36 different garments, in 10 sizes and styles. Moreover, it would accept coins, or $1 and $5 bills and make change, and scornfully kick back counterfeit currency. The store gave up the experiment, deciding rather reluctantly that we had not yet quite reached the stage of shopping for soft goods in a slot machine. But if the thing is ever perfected, it raises the interesting possibility that a store could get everybody off the payroll except the complaint clerk. The machine did not surrender tamely: it is now set up in post offices in 10 cities, selling stamps, envelopes and post cards, and spurning phony money.

President Joseph Beirne of the Communications Workers predicted in his recent book "New Horizons for Labor" that the day will come when most U.S. workers will be "people in white coats babysitting for push-buttons." The prediction cannot be taken lightly. Machines which need very little help from humanity are well past the point of mere "automation," which is to say, doing repetitive physical chores more accurately and rapidly than man and without such human fringe needs as vacations or hospital insurance. The electronic computer long since settled down comfortably as a day-to-day workhorse, taking over much of the routine and even the sophisticated clerical and statistical work of business and government.

The U.S. Veterans' Administration has installed computers to chop away all but 3,000 of 17,000 employees who once processed insurance claims. A city department store gives a computer the chore of checking 50,000 transactions in 30 minutes. An airline has tied all its ticket offices together in a computer system which keeps track of traffic, assigns passengers to seats and even joggles moonstruck human clerks with a reminder to take down the customer's phone number.

The next step is called "cybernation." This is a fairly new term coined by dismayed man from the Greek kybernētēs, which means "steersman." It describes a world controlled by electromechanics in which machines take over most of man's functions, mental as well as physical—excluding only eating, sleeping, dreaming, complaining, and making love.

Cybernation takes account of both automated doing machines and computerized analyzing and deciding machines. When the most sophisticated of the doers and thinkers are mated, they can reduce most of mankind to the wretched role of "consumer," foreseen by Aldous Huxley in his grisly 1932 science fiction, "Brave New World."

Let no stubborn optimist hope that the robots will not be mated, for they already are. Photon, Inc., of Wilmington, Mass., which manufactures photoelectric typesetting machines, has come up with a new gadget named, with terrifying accuracy, "Zip." Zip links the old model-T, semi-automated photographic typesetting principle to computers capable, when so instruct-

ed, of remembering, selecting, and giving orders. The result is a device which can set type at the rate of 450 characters a second while, at the same time, revising and updating such rapidly changing material as telephone books. Zip is roughly 50 times faster than the best previous man-machine combinations for doing the same thing. Zip could reset the entire Manhattan telephone directory, all 1,804 pages of it, in just 29 hours and 43 minutes.

The Fund for the Republic recently financed a study of the outlook for cybernation which was conducted by the Center for the study of democratic institutions. Commenting on the versatility of so-called learning and decisionmaking machines, the study remarked rather snottily that some now seem capable of only "a fair amateur game of chess." But it admitted that the same machines are whizzes at checkers. They get so good that, after 10 to 20 hours of instruction, they begin to devise original strategy and tactics and to beat the human who taught them the game.

"It is no fantasy, then, to be concerned with the implications of the thinking machines," the study observes. "There is every reason to believe that within the next two decades machines will be available outside the laboratory that will do a credible (a last-ditch human would have said creditable) job of original thinking, certainly as good thinking as that expected of most middle-level people who are supposed to 'use their minds.' "

Finally, in the envisioned society which promises the elimination of most human effort, except for a tiny elite of bosses and technicians who build and teach and more or less understand the machines, the big question must be asked: What do we do with the people?

Many old-style human brains are worrying about the problem today. There are even a few people actually doing something about it. Unluckily the worriers outnumber the doers.

The head worrier is Secretary of Labor Wirtz. But the Secretary sounded none too confident in recent testimony before a House subcommittee. "We have been assuming that the developing technology—what we call automation—will provide as many new jobs as it replaces," he said. "I say we have been assuming that. I am not sure it is right. * * * I assume we shall find those jobs because we must find the jobs."

What appeared to worry the Secretary most is the paradox that while we are fast running out of use for people, we are at the same time ironically producing people faster than ever. In the decade of the fifties, he said, we added 8.3 million new people who needed jobs, but in the sixties we are producing 12.6 million brandnew job applicants. Naturally, since humans are somewhat disorderly in their habits anyhow, this piling up of surplus new humanity does not proceed in an entirely orderly fashion. Lately every crop-year of new 18-year-olds has been a bumper one—averaging in the neighborhood of 2.5 million; but in this staggering decade the 1964–65 crop-year of 18-year-olds (babies born in 1946–47) figures to be the alltime humdinger with nearly 4 million.

Recently Secretary Wirtz took part in a daylong communal worry about the matter at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. He said he can foresee the development of a "human slag heap." The Waldorf session was unique because, for the first time, it brought together all three of the vitally concerned forces—labor, management, and Government—in a common effort to tackle a monstrous human dilemma that no one or two can handle alone. However, there is little present evidence that all three together can handle it either.

Among those doing something about it, the Federal Government exhibits abundant concern but has not yet made much of a dent in the labor surplus. The administration's Manpower Development and Training Act became Federal law in 1962 but did not get moving until last September, when funds were appropriated. In the months since, 40,000 persons have been "approved" for training or retraining; 20,000 had actually begun training by last June 1 and 5,700 had completed training. By next year, if it gets the appropriations, the MDTA program hopes to have as many as 100,000 in training. After the third year, by law, the program's future will be at the mercy of State legislatures, which will have to put up half the cost—estimated at $2,000 per trainee.

Not long ago, speaking on the "stark realities" of the technological revolution, John Snyder attacked "the myth that those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money. Not only are there fewer jobs available today, but many workers are not retrainable in the first place, due to the level of intelligence, age, or aptitude * * *. You cannot force people into retraining, nor can you manufacture jobs out of thin air."

This proposition is not disproved by the occasional miracles which do occur. The alltime champion retrainee is, beyond doubt, a meatcutter who, displaced by layoff at the Cudahy packing plant in Omaha, went into retraining and ended up as a professor of languages at the University of Omaha.

Some of the biggest unions are trying hard to upgrade their people to the future. The 793,000-member Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has put 50,000 employees through courses in modern industrial electronics. These schools are financed, roughly, one-half by the union and the other half jointly by union and management through the Joint Apprenticeship Committee. On its own, the IBEW conducts courses in the care and feeding of nuclear powerplants. Topgrade men, chosen by locals all over the country, are sent to Washington to take the course and thereafter are expected to instruct fellow members in this new atomic energy technique. Similar courses are planned in the Midwest and on the west coast.

But, for the most part, the actual things done have been isolated efforts to take a chewable mouthful. Some seem only remotely related to the looming crisis of automation but, in a larger sense, as the new technology evolves, each job saved or created is a human being rescued from the machines.

One of the more exciting efforts to meet the automation crisis is paradoxically one of the smallest. It is exciting because it is dramatic and successful, and because—although its primary purpose was a frank desire to create jobs and profits for the men who undertook it—the project also embraced a much larger and unselfish concept. It is most exciting of all because of who did it. The doers were, of all people, the 9,000 members of the Chicago Flat Janitors Union.

The janitors financed, built, own and now also sweep the halls of the most spectacular new crag on the skyline of Chicago. This is Marina City, two dazzling 60-story cylindrical towers for housing people and autos, raised on the banks of the Chicago River and soaring over a commercial complex which includes everything from a bowling alley and a legitimate theater to a 700-yacht boat basin.

The janitors were prodded into the adventure by their 68-year-old president, William L. McFetridge, who had just retired from wearing his second hat as president of the parent union, the Building Service Employees International. McFetridge had been brooding for years because Chicago, like many cities, was decaying at the center while people fled from their apartments to houses in the suburbs where, naturally, they no longer needed a janitor. He wanted jobs for janitors and other crafts in the union. And he believed that his union people owed some mystic obligation to help rejuvenate their town.

At first McFetridge felt the union might risk a few hundred thousand dollars. But he got title to a unique piece of real estate—about 3 acres on the riverbank, just outside the famous Loop. It was "lot 1, block 1" in Chicago's original 1857 city plat. He then commissioned a 36-year-old real estate promotor, Charles R. Swibel, and a 49-year-old architect, Bertrand Goldberg, to do justice to this fancy acreage. "Justice" simply ran away with itself. Eventually the union men had $3,100,000 of their own hard dollars on the line. Architect Goldberg's problem was to think big and imaginatively. Swibel's biggest problem was to mesmerize the Federal Housing Authority into a semantic rewriting the rules in order to guarantee an $8 million mortgage. The janitor's problem was to keep a collective stiff upper lip.

Today the janitors own a $36 million ultramodern city-within-a-city. Land next door to that which they bought for $18.50 a square foot now sells for $45. Three other projects, inspired by Marina City and totaling investments of something over $500 million, are underway nearby. The union could sell out for a profit of millions. Meanwhile, it has picked up 43 new jobs inside its own property and stands to pick up hundreds more in the neighboring new projects.

A more direct frontal assault on automation has been the highly controversial handiwork of a New York labor leader, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., business manager of Local 3 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. A year ago he forced New York's construction industry to accept a 25-hour week, plus 5 hours of mandatory overtime, for his 9,000 elite "A-card" members, the journeymen electrical construction workers.

Van Arsdale's pitch was that new fabricating and installation techniques have "engineered all the labor out of the job." This creates more electrical work but it doesn't create more jobs.

"They wanted to know why I was insisting on it right now when there's a lot of new building going up in the city. They thought I was just building a cushion for a lot of overtime and would kill off construction by pricing it out of the market," Van Arsdale says. "But I told them I had to do it now because if I tried it some other time, they wouldn't give it to me."

To ease the blow, Van Arsdale made certain concessions. He has agreed to take in 1,000 new apprentices in a union traditionally so closely held that about the only way to get in was to be the son of a member. He also declared there would be no abuse of overtime. "To get more, you've got to give more," he told his members.

Whether the 25-hour week will prove out to the eventual advantage of both union and employers, there is no doubt whatever that Van Arsdale believes in it as an article of faith. "America will be a much better place when everybody works 4 hours a day and attends some kind of classes 4 hours," he says.

Nor is he kidding about attending classes. The local has financed 345 scholarships for the children of members and is now conducting a campaign to prevent children of lower-paid members from dropping out of school. Seeking out latent talent and hoping to develop the union's future leaders, the local created what it calls the "futurian society," in which more than 50 college-trained members—mostly construction workers—have conducted citizenship courses for more than 2,000 other members. Because Van Arsdale believes that every man owes it to himself to learn to use his noodle, more than 5,000 members have passed through Bayberry Land, a Long Island estate where the union conducts intensive one-week seminars in such unelectrical abstractions as literature and world politics.

Still another, different but just as controversial, attack took effect last March 1 at the Fontana, Calif. plant of the Kaiser Steel Co. The device is called the long-range sharing plan. This is not a profit-sharing plan as such—and thus differs in principle from the American Motors plan. Instead, this is an agreement that company and workers will share—approximately two-thirds to the company and one-third to the workers—whatever can be saved by automation. Improvements in technique or greater efficiency in the use of time and materials.

To the union the company promises that no worker will lose his personal employment because of automated technology. Instead, if his job is eliminated, he will go into a reserve labor pool and will continue to draw his pay. Men in the reserve will be occupied by whatever chores can be found for them or, if none can be be found. will be a force ready to fill in for absentees or possibly to fabricate items which the company would normally buy outside. From the company's point of view, the reserve pool is an asset; instead of being off somewhere fishing or looking for another job, men will be ready at hand whenever expanded production requires more human bodies. It has been calculated that the reserve pool should not grow unbearably burdensome since the normal 8 percent annual rate of personnel attrition by death or retirement should about equal the rate of elimination of jobs by automation.

The proposal was submitted to the 5,500-member Kaiser local last January and the members voted it in by a majority of 74 percent of the production and maintenance crews and 90 percent of the clerical staff. The vote amounted mainly to acceptance in principle; many steel workers in the production end, by long tradition, enjoy certain bonus rights contractually described as incentive pay. Historically these have made for a chaotic mishmash of pay rates, but those entitled to such bonuses are understandably reluctant to give them up. The long range sharing plan entailed the surrender of all incentive pay for those electing to take part in it. Most of the crews with incentive pay contractual rights elected to wait and see how it worked out.

Meanwhile, a surprising thing happened. Employees and employee groups began coming in with suggestions on ways to speed things up or save materials. A work gang suggested ways to calculate estimates of needed material more closely in order to save waste. Another reported that some expensive tools had been stored out in the open and should be taken in under cover before rain, rust, and dust ruined them.

Early in May, Kaiser announced the result of the first full month's operation of the plan. The improved techniques had saved $962,000 in March—a whopping windfall of $312,000 for the 3,930 workers who had got all the way in—an average of $79 per employee. By the third month the benefits had grown to $1,083,000.

"This is a good agreement," says Marvin Miller, assistant to Steel Workers President Dave McDonald and the union officer chiefly concerned in the long negotiations. "We took our time and worked out most of the bugs."

"Of course," he adds, "it's not the full answer to automation, but nothing else is either. What this does is slow down the process of eliminating people—but we know it doesn't stop the process."

Asking what the whole machine-instead-of-man process costs is like asking how high the sky is. Secretary Wirtz calculated that the Nation already loses about $30 to $40 billion a year in unused and unusable human resources. Harry Van Arsdale uses a longer yardstick: "This country cannot afford to throw away the $90 billion in gross national product that goes unproduced because people who could work can't," he says.

John Snyder, who builds automatic machines and was introduced at the start of this article, is profoundly concerned by the human implications of what he does. He has arrived at his own unique partial answer. Every time he sells a machine to displace flesh and blood, he "taxes" it up to $1,000. The money thus set aside supports an institution unique to American industry, the American Foundation on Automation and Employment. The foundation is now making depth studies into several facets of the problem: The short workweek, early retirement, the older worker, Western European legislation on the subject, retraining, the kinds of education which will be demanded by the age of cybernation.

"What the total answers are nobody knows, but we are trying to find some of them," Snyder says. "I think it possible that the day will come when the machines will do nearly all the work and produce nearly all of our goods and services—even decisions—and, since there'll be little work for humans, the machines will also have to pay our taxes.

"This implies a total reorientation of human society. Humans will become wards of the machines, supported by the machines. But the great unanswerable question is, What, then, will happen to the souls of people? We will have to build things from the inside out. People—living, breathing, feeling and thinking people—somehow will have to learn how to do nothing in a constructive way."

[AFL-CIO American Federationist, July, 1963]

EXPANDING APPRENTICESHIP FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By John F. Henning)

(John F. Henning is Under Secretary of Labor. As Manpower Administrator of the U.S. Department of Labor, he also serves as chairman of the 15-member Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. Formerly he served as director of the California Department of Industrial Relations and chief labor adviser to Governor Brown. Previously he was with the California AFL-CIO.)

American Negro demands for fair employment have turned sharply to a precise area of dispute: apprenticeship training.

The new emphasis is hardly surprising. Skilled journeymen are the income elite of manual labor. They look to a brightening future. All responsible projections of U.S. labor force needs cite the continuing call for skilled labor and the declining proportions of unskilled work.

Back in 1957 the U.S. Department of Labor issued its now historic projections of the labor force requirements of the 1960's. The study estimated that in 1970 America will need 42 percent more professional and technical workers than in 1960, 24 percent more sales and service personnel, 22 percent more skilled workers and 18 percent more semiskilled. The percentage of the unskilled will be down.

The prophecy presumes a full employment economy in 1970. Without economic growth, both skilled and unskilled will suffer. But not alike. For example, during the past 5 years, the national unemployment rate has approximated a disturbingly high 5.5 percent, but in this period the jobless rate among the unskilled has been at least twice that of the skilled. Whatever the course of the economy, the days of the unskilled appear numbered.

Long ago Benjamin Franklin observed that he who hath a trade hath an estate. The difficulty is that he who hath a trade usually hath a white skin.

As in Franklin's time, the one certain road to journeyman training is the apprenticeship system. To some the road seems a narrow, twisted trail, bordered by bigotry and privilege. Whatever its hazards, more than 150,000 young Americans today are found in registered apprenticeship programs.

The average apprenticeship embraces 4 years of on-the-job training and normally entails 144 hours of related classroom instruction a year.

The tri-partite forces of labor, management and government shape the character of apprenticeship training. But the shape of things does not satisfy any American sensitive to the demands of democracy.

Federal responsibility came to apprenticeship with the adoption of the Fitzgerald Act in 1937.

The Fitzgerald Act called for Federal and State government promotion of labor-management apprenticeship programs. The Government role has been noncontrolling in that actual on-the-job training has been directed by the employer, usually under union-negotiated conditions.

The Government role has been significant in that the U.S. Department of Labor and the several State apprenticeship agencies fix minimum standards for program registration. Registration entitles apprentices in approved programs to employment on federal public works projects and assures approved programs of the services of the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training or the services of the pertinent state agency. Historically, Federal registration of programs has applied alike to State-sponsored as well as federally directed programs.

Thirty States manage their own apprenticeship agencies. In the remaining 20, the Federal Government alone sponsors and guides apprenticeship.

Civil rights spokesmen long have held the idea that Federal registration should be denied any program stained by ethnic discrimination. AFL-CIO President George Meany agrees. Meany backed a 1961 attempt to write such a denial into Federal law. Meany noted, however, that discrimination in apprenticeship is only part of total job discrimination. He urged enactment of a National Fair Employment Practices Act with full powers of enforcement.

But the immediate question is—what can be realized in the absence of a national FEP law?

In July 1961, then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg announced the Department of Labor would thereafter require the inclusion of a specific nondiscrimination statement in all apprenticeship standards of firms handling Government contracts. He further declared a similar provision would be required in the registration of any new apprenticeship program regardless of its relationship to Federal works.

Labor Department action did not die with the Goldberg pronouncement. The following achievements merit attention:

I

Within the past year, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training assigned four minority consultants to the task of opening opportunities to Negroes and other minority peoples. Now located in Washington, New York, Chicago and San Francisco, they counsel with employers, joint apprenticeship committees and unions on a regional basis to encourage acceptance of qualified minority applicants. Additionally, they advise minority groups on apprenticeship fundamentals and admission processes.

II

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz on February 27, 1963, announced the appointment of a National Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. The committee consists of 15 members: 4 from management, 4 from labor,

5 from minority organizations and 2 from the public.

The Advisory Committee held its first meeting in Washington on May 14 under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Labor. The committee developed a five-point action program:

First. The establishment of apprenticeship information centers in certain critical cities throughout the Nation.

Second. The fostering of apprenticeship information centers through State apprenticeship councils wherever feasible.

Third. The creation of research programs to measure the present depth of minority participation in apprenticeship programs.

Fourth. The implementation of present antidiscrimination provisions in apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Fifth. The consideration of preapprenticeship programs for the training of young workers not qualified for admission to apprenticeship programs.

III

The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, the District of Columbia Commissioners and school authorities, the U.S. Employment Service, labor, and management, opened its first Apprenticeship Information Center on June 17 in the Nation's Capital.

The information center, which the Department proposes to extend throughout the Nation, offers young apprenticeship applicants personal and group counseling, aptitude testing, information on educational requirements, and related data pertaining to District apprenticeship programs. It also offers an orderly system of referral to joint apprenticeship committees and serves as a point of contact for unions, employers, and minority groups.

The values of the information center are intended for all young Americans, whatever their race, color, creed, or national origin. But the center should be of particular value to Negroes and other minorities from whom the knowledge of admission procedures and requirements often has been withheld.

IV

Secretary of Labor Wirtz issued a directive to all joint apprenticeship committees of the District of Columbia June 5, 1963, on the discrimination crisis in the District jurisdiction. The Secretary listed the following requirements for programs hoping to enjoy Federal registration rights:

1. If apprentices are not selected by a merit system alone, selections must be made in a manner that demonstrates equality of opportunity.

2. Waiting lists which reflect previous discriminatory practices must be subjected to whatever action is necessary to offset such discrimination.

V

President Kennedy on June 4, 1963, directed the Secretary of Labor to require that "admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis."

VI

Following Secretary Wirtz' order of June 11, 1963, the Bureau of Apprenticeship began a 50-city check of Negro apprenticeship participation in Federal construction projects.

The varied activities here cited indicate the commitment of the Kennedy administration to equality of opportunity in apprenticeship.

The President held a national conference with 300 labor officials at the White House June 13 in which he called for the end of job discrimination at every level of union jurisdiction. This was one of a number of conferences on civil rights held with businessmen, educators, clergymen, and lawyers.

However, the President noted that genuine equality of opportunity could be meaningful only in a full employment economy.

National morality and the times will permit nothing less than full job equality, but without full employment this means sharing job scarcity regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. Job equality must mean sharing the bounty, not the scarcity of national life. But apprenticeship at its fullest would hardly have the capacity to solve youth unemployment. The problem is beyond that.

During the calendar year 1962, teenage unemployment averaged 13 percent against an overall national figure of 5.6 percent. During 1962 the average teenage unemployment total was 816,000 workers.

Between 1957 and 1962 the total number of registered apprentices in training averaged 150,000.

Apprentices in training today average only 3 percent of the 5,077,000 teenage workers in the U.S. labor force. Of the teenage total, 3,017,000 are male.

The apprenticeship solution assumes even less promise when pictured against a 50-percent mortality rate. The consistent national experience suggests that only one-half of those now in training will know journeyman status.

The proportionate place of apprenticeship must also be seen in the perspective of the awesome burdens the American economy will confront in the 1960's.

The U.S. Department of Labor tells that the economy must provide 34.5 million new jobs in the 1960's to match the demands of population growth and technological change.

The labor force will realize a net increase of 12.5 million through population expansion. This involves an increase of 26 million young workers. Death and the retirement of older workers will determine the 12.5 million net figure.

The technological impact will be greater. The Labor Department estimates the annual rate of productivity increase will be about 3 percent throughout the 1960's. This means the output per man-hour will jump about 3 percent each year. The job displacement statistics become frightening when the 3 percent productivity rate is applied to an annual average employment figure of 74 million workers. For the sixties this means the economy must provide 2.2 million new jobs each year to care for technological progress. The decade's demand will be 22 million jobs.

The statistics are germane because apprenticeship, unlike vocational education, always has been a job-related training system. Unless employers determine to hire apprentices there is no apprenticeship system. Further, unions relate the number of admitted apprentices to the number of employed journeymen.

Given full employment, apprenticeship could come to its greatness.

But at this hour, the immediate crisis of apprenticeship discrimination plagues the national conscience and cries for action.

The Kennedy administration reforms must succeed. There is hope and precedent in the experience of California.

Four years ago Gov. Edmund G. Brown named apprenticeship bigotry a special evil and called for remedies. Adoption of an FEP law in 1959 helped greatly but was not quite enough. The subtleties of apprenticeship bias often escape FEP enforcement.

California's plan has won national praise. It features (1) statewide and local committees on apprenticeship opportunities for members of minority groups; (2) local apprentice information centers for making vital data available to high school students and graduates.

The statewide opportunities committee was founded in 1960. It is comprised, like the National Advisory Committee, of labor, management, and minority group representatives and includes Government spokesmen.

The California committee last year developed two precedent-smashing surveys of the depth of discrimination.

The initial study approached the ethnic identity of the more than 20,000 apprentices receiving training in California. The second involved an ethnic sampling of journeymen who completed their apprentice training in 1955.

The first survey, based on a one-third return of questionnaires, revealed the startling evidence that there were 283 American Indians participating in California apprenticeship programs as against 150 Negroes. Mexican-Americans numbered 521, Japanese-Americans 31, and Chinese-Americans 18.

The findings suggest that Negroes number just a bit more than 2 percent of California's apprentices. In the Federal census of 1960, Negroes formed 5.8 percent of the total State population and 4.7 percent of the State's male labor force.

The State committee data on minority representation among journeymen certified in 1955 also are revealing.

A one-fourth return of inquiries pegged Negro participation at 1.5 percent.

The journeymen survey indicates the rewarding nature of skilled employment. Seventy-two percent of the graduate apprentices were earning $7,000 or more a year, while 52.4 percent were earning over $8,000 per annum. Only 11.2 percent were earning less than $6,000 per year.

Ninety percent were enjoying full employment on a yearly basis.

Both surveys confirm the skilled labor problem of the Negro. But the totals do not necessarily prove discrimination. For example, in certain survey areas Negroes had rarely, if ever, applied for apprenticeship admission. The failure could represent either resignation to bias or the absence of training qualifications.

Traditionally, Negroes have been the particular victims of hasty and frequently indifferent counseling in the high school systems. In California's soaring school population, a senior student is fortunate if he receives 1 hour of personal counseling in his final year. This obtains for any student whatever his race or skin. The national practice is scarcely different.

Each year thousands of young Americans emerge from the secondary schools without any sense of occupational direction. Adequate high school counseling would be of particular benefit to the children of Negro families recently removed from the agrarian South. These young people suffer the same lack of skilled labor tradition as did most of the 19th century European immigrants who poured into America searching for freedom and opportunity.

But where immigrant Europeans could seek manual labor in coal and steel and maritime employment, today's young Negro faces a labor market in which there is little future for the unskilled.

Not only because of discrimination but also because of lack of skills, Negro unemployment is consistently twice the overall national average. In the calendar year 1962 the rate of unemployment among Negroes was 11 percent against a national average of 5.6 percent. Negroes represent 11 percent of all American workers but represent 22 percent of all unemployed.

As indicated earlier, economic growth is the first requisite of full employment in the 1960's, the full employment that will give job opportunity to all Americans.

Economic growth, however, will not find employment for the unskilled.

America needs an active labor market policy to accompany the fiscal and monetary policies of growth. An active labor market policy would directly answer the training

needs of the U.S. labor force. The rate of unemployment among unskilled workers in the calendar year 1962 was 12 percent against the national average of 5.6 percent.

An active labor market policy also would end racial and ethnic discrimination in employment.

But it would do more than that. It would also achieve these ambitions:

First. An updated labor market informations service for workers and employers.

Second. An employment service warning system for impending technological changes and other changes causing serious job displacement.

Third. An effective informational service for career guidance and counseling.

Fourth. An educational system, vocational as well as academic, which would answer current and upcoming manpower needs.

Fifth. An expanded apprenticeship training program.

Sixth. An improved system of job placement services.

Seventh. A program for aiding the mobility of workers.

In summary, it is obvious that Negro discrimination in apprenticeship has its unique and general features. The Negro suffers because of his skin. But he suffers also because he often is an unskilled worker in an economy which has limited place for the unskilled. Finally, he suffers because he is a worker in a society which has not yet found the way to full employment.

The issue of employment discrimination is not peculiar to apprenticeship. It will be found everywhere, including the banking, insurance, and newspaper worlds. It will be found in the professions and the religions of America. Indeed, discrimination is often strongest in sectors of nonunion employment.

American labor must persist in its efforts to realize full employment and the abolition of the last measure of job discrimination. The efforts must reach to the State councils, local councils, and local unions.

The matter is moral. For more than 100 years labor has served as the social conscience of the Nation. Unpurchased and unafraid, it has led the everlasting struggle to attain a society in which bread, security, and freedom shall be the right of all Americans whatever their racial, religious, or ethnic identity.

Labor holds priceless credentials of sacrifice and struggle. It must use these credentials now as mortal conflict shakes the Nation. The honor and duty of leadership rest with the trade union movement.

WHERE LABOR STANDS

"There is general agreement that the demand for skilled workers will grow very rapidly in the next decade, while the opportunities for unskilled workers will continue to shrink.

"Therefore our interest—and the national interest—must look to an across-the-board increase in apprenticeship training.

"In order to insure—as we must and we should—full opportunity for Negroes and other minorities to enter these skilled trades, we must have full opportunity for all candidates.

"Let me put it this way: We are opposed to the exclusion of any candidate for apprenticeship on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin. We are also opposed to the selection of any candidate on those grounds. We want a place for every qualified candidate, on an open and equal basis. We believe this bill, with the improvements I have suggested, will help toward that end; and I repeat, we endorse it.

"The problem demands much more than a piecemeal approach. It demands vigorous action to stimulate employment; it demands a strong, enforceable fair employment practices law.

"The legislative branch of our Government has lagged far behind the executive and judicial branches in recognizing the imperative need for wiping our segregation and discrimination. It is our hope that the present bill represents only a first step in redressing the balance."—AFL-CIO President George Meany, testifying before a House Education and Labor Subcommittee on a bill to promote equal opportunity in apprenticeship programs, August 21, 1961.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON PENDING MEASURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he has given further consideration to limiting debate on amendments on motions, and on the bill itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, he will recall that we had a conversation earlier today on the subject. With his permission and with the permission of the Senate I should like at this time to propound a unanimous-consent request, as follows:

That beginning at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, 30 minutes of debate be allowed on each amendment to be offered to the pending legislation, and that the time be equally divided between the proponent of the bill and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]; that 2 hours of debate be allowed on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from New York whether that meets with his agreement on the amendment which he proposes to offer, and whether it would be regarded as germane to the pending bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I have an amendment to the bill. It is numbered 144. It relates to the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway in New York State. I could propound a parliamentary inquiry, and the question could be settled that way; the Senator could make the unanimous-consent agreement apply to the amendments at the desk. I propound the parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not amendment No. 144 is considered germane to the bill, within the concept of the unanimous-consent agreement which is now sought.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from New York will yield——

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be perfectly willing to have this amendment included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest one modification. I believe that on the motion to recommit an hour and a half ought to be allowed, with 45 minutes on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be happy to ask for 3 hours on the bill, instead of 2 hours, to make sure that sufficient time will be allotted to the motion to recommit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then an hour would be allowed on each amendment; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A half-hour on each amendment, and 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. That is agreeable, so long as it is understood that the amendment I intend to offer is preserved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I would be willing to make it 40 minutes on each amendment, with 20 minutes to a side.

Mr. President, I modify my unanimous consent request to provide for 1 hour of debate on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]; and 2 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. It is understood that the amendment which I shall offer is considered to be within the context of that agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I add also the usual conditions with respect to germaneness, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designed by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill (except amendment No. 144 by Mr. JAVITS which shall be in order) shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to have an interchange on the civil rights situation in the country today, which I believe is pertinent to what we face today.

Yesterday a distinguished member of the other body, the chairman of its Committee on Education and Labor, made a

statement in New York at the church, of which he is the pastor, which, generally speaking, said that white leaders should take a secondary position in the civil rights struggle.

Normally one would not react to such a statement. But I was asked for a comment; and as it seems to typify the civil rights struggle, and as my credentials in that struggle are considered fairly good, I believe it might be useful to say a word about it.

My response to the request for comment was that I thought a host of liberals, white and Negro alike, had worked far too hard and too long on civil rights to accept the proposition that there are any second or first places in this struggle, either for whites or for Negroes.

I ask this important question, which I believe is central to the civil rights debate,and probably it is a question most apposite for a person like myself to ask.

Since when has a minority succeeded by alienating a friendly majority? The answer is obvious. A minority, to succeed, must keep the loyalty and support of a friendly majority. That is perhaps best illustrated by what will happen in the struggle which will be involved in passing even the present President's limited civil rights package, and will be further illustrated when we seek to add a provision against discrimination in jobs—what is popularly called the FEPC provision—or a provision giving general authority for the Attorney General to sue in civil rights cases; for example, in such cases as those that brought on the Birmingham disorders and which militated so very heavily against the United States in the world and shocked the conscience of our country.

Since that essentially related to the subject of police activity, it could be reached by general authority of the Attorney General to sue in civil rights cases.

Measures of that character, added to the President's package—and even the President's package itself—will be difficult enough to pass without anybody who is sympathetic and friendly and desirous of helping, being ruled out of the struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, appearing in the New York Tribune related to these occurrences of yesterday, may also be made a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 29, 1963]

POWELL'S BIAS-FIGHT DICTUM: A BACK-SEAT ROLE FOR WHITE LIBERALS

(By Earl G. Talbott)

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, rattled a civil rights saber at "white liberals" yesterday, telling a Harlem rally that white supporters must accept a secondary role in the struggle and calling for accelerated demonstrations by Negroes, but without violence.

His remarks drew an immediate rebuttal from Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, who pointed out that "there are no second or first places in this struggle for liberals or Negroes."

In his speech, Mr. POWELL, who heads the House Education and Labor Committee, also threatened to bypass normal procedure and seek a showdown in the House on a bill establishing a fair employment practices commission and another one to withhold Federal funds from segregated schools at every level of education.

"No white man, any more, is going to tell me what I should do in the field of civil rights," the Congressman told a meeting at the Abyssinian Baptist Church, 132 West 138th Street.

"They never have, and never will," he added, somewhat contradictorily.

Referring to what he called "the black revolution," Mr. POWELL said white liberals took the lead in its first phase, which lasted for several years, but now, in its secondary stage, Negroes had taken over, and no effort by the whites to regain control would be tolerated.

"We are not antiwhite," he insisted. "We welcome the support, physically, morally, mentally, spiritually, and financially, of whites. But the white liberal has got to make up his mind he must accept a secondary role.

"The white man might as well make up his mind all he's going to be facing from now on is black unilateral action. On tomorrow at 12:30 I will consult my leaders—A. Phillip Randolph, Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, Jim Farmer, John Lewis, and I will do as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor what they tell me to do."

(Mr. Randoph is president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, the Reverend Dr. King is president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Mr. Wilkins is executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Young is executive director of the National Urban League, Mr. Farmer is national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Mr. Lewis is national chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.)

Asked to comment, Senator JAVITS, one of the country's leading liberal lawmakers, said:

"A whole host of liberals, white and Negro alike, have worked far too hard and too long on civil rights to accept Congressman POWELL'S statement of yesterday proposing to relegate white liberals to second place in the civil rights struggle. There are no second or first places in this struggle for liberals or Negroes.

"Also, the fight for civil rights is, and has been, traditionally bipartisan. It will take all the friends of civil rights to bring full success now.

"Since when has a minority succeeded by alienating a friendly majority? It will be hard enough to win in the Congress for the President's civil rights package, FEPC and other urgently needed civil rights legislation without barring any sincere friend of the cause.

"There is neither room nor need for Negro or other exclusivity in civil rights. It can only bring chauvinism and change the character of the struggle.

"The majority of the country, which is white, is being won to civil rights so much by the fair, wise, and broad understanding of the Negroes and of Negro leadership and by the Negroes' determination to fight for the true character of America.

"It is a time when this policy is succeeding. Let it not be jettisoned on the threshold of full success."

In his speech Mr. POWELL referred to a civil rights conference last week at which the 40 leaders present rejected his proposal for a showdown on FEPC and the school fund cutoff plan. But, he added, all but three of them were white. One of those at this "nearly lily white" talk said he didn't want any "unilateral action," Mr. POWELL said.

Both bills have passed Mr. Powell's committee, but not much chance is given them of clearing the House Rules Committee in the usual way. If the Congressman does jump the gun and invoke his right as a committee chairman to force action through the Calendar Wednesday procedure, he is apt to provoke a bitter preliminary battle which, in the opinion of parliamentary observers, would lead to nothing but an angry stalemate.

Under Calendar Wednesday, which is rarely used, a committee-approved bill can be offered for a vote without clearing the Rules Committee, but action on it must be completed on the same legislative day or it is dead for the rest of the session.

The procedure is called Calendar Wednesday because Wednesday is the day set aside for calling up committee-approved bills. In 1909 it supplanted the "morning hour," a fixed period of 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL and his adherents want to get the FEPC bill (which establishes a commission to guard against racial discrimination in hiring) to a vote on or before the mass civil rights march on Washington, August 28.

Others, however, are afraid of a knockdown struggle in Congress on just one or two phases of the issue and prefer to concentrate their big guns on President Kennedy's omnibus civil rights package, which does not include either of the proposals being pushed by Mr. POWELL.

It is considered highly unlikely that the President's program could get action in either House or Senate by August 28. This week, committees of both Chambers will continue public hearings and are expected to write their own recommendations within a few days.

At yesterday's rally, Mr. POWELL voiced his approval of the mass march but said the participants should be confined to registered voters, except for persons from areas where the Negro hasn't got the vote.

"It shows a lack of self-respect and an insult to our racial dignity for a man or a woman to make a trip 500 miles from New York to Washington, D.C., who won't make a trip 5 miles downtown to become a registered voter," he said.

At a press conference at the church, he said he favored a quota system to get Negroes jobs in construction and other industries as "the only way to break the backlog of jobs overdue." This would not be a permanent solution, he conceded, and added that he opposed preferential treatment for members of his race.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question with respect to the situation to which I have referred, which occurred yesterday, goes even deeper than that, because an interesting reflection is cast upon it by a very comprehensive survey undertaken by Newsweek magazine, which appears in its current issue.

The Newsweek survey, taken by the famous pollster, Louis Harris, indicates interesting attitudes on the part of the Negro community, which, at the present state of the struggle, bear great note so far as the country is concerned.

In the first place, it is indicated that a substantial minority—22 percent—believe that if the Negro is to get justice in this country, he has only himself to rely on; that there may even be violence in the course of trying to obtain justice; and that the white man will yield only to force. I would describe this position as generally the extreme point of view.

The important thing to me, is that 63 percent of the Negroes believe the white man will come around eventually to persuasion; 52 percent think the white man's attitude toward the Negro has improved over the past 5 years and 73 percent are optimistic about the next 5

years through an alliance with the majority of the country. To me, this is the most hopeful aspect of the survey and bears out, on the whole, the discipline, understanding, and great wisdom which have been evidenced by the quality of the protests and demonstrations undertaken under the leadership and inspiration of such men as Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, James Farmer, and others, who have led in this very determined but, at the same time, understanding way, and which, on the whole, has not offended our laws and has not resulted in any major violence, certainly on the part of the demonstrators.

There are laws in the Southern States which purport to be offended; but I am not speaking of them because I believe that most of us as lawyers understand that although it will take some time, perhaps, to cause them to be invalidated in the Federal courts, laws which seek to perpetuate discrimination and segregation, and which establish special rules of conduct for Negroes on account of color or to suppress their lawful determination to fight for the expression of their grievances, will not long stand in the courts of our country and in our day.

However, we do draw certain very clear lessons from the status of the civil rights struggle today. I should like to spell those out now. I shall address myself to them in even greater detail as we go along. But the occurrence of yesterday so impressed itself upon my mind that I should like to spell out some of the things which appear important to me at this time in the struggle.

First, as I said when I began, there is no exclusivity about it. In short, the help of all Americans, white and Negro, is welcome in this struggle. Their help is needed. It will be difficult enough to pass a law in any case; so every ounce of talent, every ounce of skill, every ounce of strength will be needed in that cause.

An exclusivity that will confine itself solely to Negroes will jeopardize the hope of success, will bring about a program of chauvinism which will hurt the struggle.

The second tenet is clear, because of the gains already made by pursuing the kind of policy I have described—of no violence, but of peaceful protest demonstrations, and a testing of laws which, in many cases, are either directly unconstitutional or anachronistic, and which seek to inhibit the authority of the individual and the right of the individual to seek redress of grievances by proper and lawful means. That is the second tenet—no violence.

The third tenet, which comes from testimony taken before the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be a member, is that accelerated training is vital. It now appears that almost the whole structure of equal rights in this country must ultimately be built upon the economics which are involved. The most striking and depressing factors are the rate of unemployment among Negroes, which is somewhat more than twice that among whites; the annual per capita income of Negroes, which on the whole hovers around 50 percent of that of whites; the fact that in the higher echelons of management and the professions, Negroes are all too infrequently present, certainly not nearly of the size and consequence which are warranted by the proportion of their total number to the population of the Nation.

It is most marked in the higher professional and executive occupations.

As one seeks, as I have personally sought, to open up opportunities, one is constantly met with the claim that there is an inadequate number of qualified persons. So I would say that accelerated training for persons in all levels of the economy, especially Negroes, is important.

The training field is one place where we can make up for the accumulated wrongs which have been visited upon the Negro community for many years, including the denial of opportunity. So I would expect that in our governmental training activities and in the training activities of private business, whether profit or nonprofit, a special effort would be placed upon giving the Negro opportunities for training. There I should like to see that emphasis materially exceed the percentage which Negroes represent in the population.

It is for that reason that the struggle over apprenticeship plans and apprenticeship rules, as, for example, in the building and construction industry, is so critically important and so elementary a part of the civil rights struggle. Although I realize that in some quarters this position may be taken in order to seek to discredit unions and find fault with them by those who are against unions, nonetheless justice must be done in an evenhanded way. The requirements which we would impose generally must be imposed wherever they seem to be required. There are some unions which have been remiss in this particular area, both in providing an opportunity for jobs and membership in the unions, and particuarly in providing opportunities for apprenticeship training, in which unions are directly involved with the employers, and which will heavily determine the economic opportunities available to Negroes.

So in the case of accelerated training, I would strongly favor specially weighting in favor of the Negro at this time.

On the other hand, when it comes to job equities, I could not favor such a program, because I cannot see any excuse for discrimination against the white worker or displacing the white worker in order to give a Negro a job. It is our job to provide training and equal opportunity. Training makes for equal opportunity, whereas job quotas impose a form of discrimination.

I think there is a very clear line of demarcation. I am favorable to seeing, where the Government is involved, not only the affording of opportunities, but also sustaining a position during the training period, to a degree which would collectively and properly carry Negroes into fields where they would have a better opportunity, because they would have an equal opportunity, having been equally trained. But I cannot see the justification for job quotas which have built into them their own form of discrimination.

Finally—and perhaps this is the other of the two salient points I wish to make today—there is a great opportunity opening up for American business and for the private sector in respect of the civil rights situation. I know that American business, especially big American business, is looking around now very carefully and very interestedly in order to determine what opportunities which have been closed to Negroes could now be opened to them.

I think that is all to the good; and, first and foremost, I very strongly commend this acceleration of training and the weighting of training in favor of Negroes, who for all these decades have been denied these opportunities.

I also hope for an enlargement in management's point of view in order to accommodate the use in higher echelons of management of Negroes who have that capacity, or at least seem likely to have that potential, and to give them training of the type which will enable them to function in the higher echelons of management. In short, there is an extraordinary dearth of Negroes who serve as vice presidents in all the echelons of American business—in banks, in insurance companies, in great industrial companies, in transportation companies—a dearth entirely inconsistent with the fact that Negroes constitute 10 percent of our population. Indeed, generally speaking, I believe it is only in government, where, in late years, Negroes have begun to serve in important policymaking positions, and there is recognition of the fact that Negroes are an important part of the American community. This is equally true in the leadership of trade unions, although I happen to know some extraordinarily fine examples of trade union leadership by Negroes. There, too, the opportunities are great, and they should be made available. However, in my opinion, the primary emphasis should be in the business area, where a very great deal can be done on the basis of self-help and mutual cooperation in order to open to Negroes doors which heretofore have been closed to them. Those doors should now be opened to all, so as really to afford a concrete basis for equality of opportunity and equality of enjoyment of the privileges of American life to all our citizens, regardless of their color.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this policy of presenting most forcefully to the Nation the desires and demands of the Negro community—a policy which, on the whole, up to now has had extraordinary success, and which, I agree with three-fourths of the Negro community, will have even more extraordinary successes in the days to come—depends even more heavily upon the fact that what is, with sincerity of conviction, sought to be developed is the truly fundamental belief in justice and fairness by the great majority of the American people. These have been the hallmarks of the success of the Negro community; and I see the danger of exclusivity, whether in the Black Muslim movement or solely in manifestations of extremism, including the use of violence or in other ways.

So I realize the very great values which have been gained, and which are to be gained in the days ahead, by bringing the country to a realization of the moral force of what is advocated and its rightness in terms of the social order, the tranquillity of our people, the efficiency of our governmental structure, and the soundness of our economy.

Recently, at my request, a study was made by the Council of Economic Advisers, which arrived at the conclusion that the affording of equal economic opportunity, in terms of the development of the economic potentials of the Negro community of the United States, would add from $13 to $17 billion to the Nation's gross national product, which today is so far behind.

Mr. President, in this frame of reference, I do not believe either the country or the Congress has anything to fear from the demonstration which will take place on August 28 in Washington, D.C. This morning, I noticed that a distinguished Catholic organization has decided to urge its members to be present on that occasion; in fact, more and more I observe that this is an across-the-board, cooperative venture for all those in American life, Negroes and whites alike, who wish to solemnize by their presence, their prestige, and their voices, the fact that justice, though long deferred, should at last be done our Negro citizens, and who believe this surely will work out for the general good so long as there is no sense of exclusivity about it, and so long as the emphasis is placed on developing the finest attributes of the character of all the American people.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this development will be greatly assisted and helped if the American private enterprise system will realize the indispensable part it can play in this entire effort. For example, I am very much interested in the testimony on the public accommodations bill now being presented before the Senate Committee on Commerce. However, there seems to be very little realization by some of the true meaning of freedom. Some who oppose the bill argue that there should be freedom either to give or to deny to the Negroes the services or facilities of restaurants, hotels, motels, or places of amusement which are in the stream of interstate commerce. But, Mr. President, those who take that position forget all too often that true freedom involves exercise of all the responsibilities which freedom brings—including the responsibility of groups of merchants or all those in particular areas, in functioning as true Americans and as merchants, not to engage in discrimination or segregations, and to seek the restraint of law only in order to deal with the recalcitrant 10 percent, rather than to assume that such attempts at inhibition represent the actual feelings of all Americans.

Long ago freedom was defined as the exercise of responsibility under the Constitution—not a license, under the guise of freedom, to destroy the Constitution and the securities and safeguards it gives.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that we shall keep in focus what is occurring. Notwithstanding the tensions and intensities of the hour, which justifiably are great, in view of the indignities and injustices which have been heaped upon the Negroes in America, and notwithstanding all the deep emotions, which are understandable, and the intensity of the demonstrations, I hope that nonetheless the great majority of the American people, even including at present three-fourths of the Negro community, will have confidence that the character of our Nation is high and moral. I believe that the great majority of the American people are determined that this issue will be resolved on the basis of justice and fairness, and that there is also widespread recognition of the fact that 90 percent of all Americans understandably have a very great interest in discharging their responsibilities in such a way that freedom may truly be realized by this 10 percent of our population who are being denied the finest benefits of freedom, and who wish to be treated in the way that all other Americans are.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McNAMARA. I would be happy to yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the measure before us, H.R. 6016, provides for additional authorizations of appropriations for existing comprehensive river basin projects, and authorizes the start of several new projects.

It is normal for the Congress to consider a rivers and harbors omnibus bill in the even years at 2- to 4-year intervals.

While nothing prevents either House from originating such measures at any time, practice has established that this interval is sound.

Now we have here, in effect, a junior omnibus bill containing 17 projects, with a total authorization of $609,547,000.

I would like to explain to the Senate the circumstances which brought this bill to us.

Last year the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of the late Senator from New Mexico, Dennis Chavez, after several months of work, prepared an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, authorizing a total of 205 projects, costing $3,553,519,800.

Included in this bill was sufficient monetary authorization to allow work to continue through fiscal year 1965 on 11 river basins:

	Millions
Arkansas River Basin	$182
Brazos River Basin	21
Central and Southern Florida	30
Columbia River Basin	226
Missouri (Corps of Engineers)	140
Ohio (Corps of Engineers)	120
Upper Mississippi	31
West Branch, Susquehanna River	5
White River Basin	11
Missouri River (Department of Interior)	100
Great Lakes-Hudson Waterway	1
Total	905

In addition, the committee determined that good and sufficient reason supported the inclusion in the bill of the following projects: New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina; Flint River, Georgia; Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Oklahoma; Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir, Kentucky-Tennessee; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Montana; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho.

The Senate sustained the committee on these projects, added the Trotters Shoals project on the Senate floor, and sent the bill to the House. Had the bill been accepted by the House, or a reasonable compromise worked out in conference, it would have been unnecessary for us to have to consider H.R. 6016 today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Florida correctly understand that all of the projects added by the Senate Committee last year and excluded in conference had been approved by the Corps of Engineers and were ready for authorization?

Mr. McNAMARA. That was true of all projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was true of all projects which were included in the committee report, in the committee bill, and also the project which was added on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. In the case of Trotters Shoals, the project had been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and was subsequently approved by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. But the judgment of the House was to eliminate the authorizations of additional appropriations for continuing the river basins, which made it necessary to write legislation this year.

Further, the House insisted that the added Senate projects should not be included.

The argument of the House on this matter was that it had not as yet held hearings.

In conference the Senate receded to this position after receiving what it considered an iron-clad agreement that the House would hold hearings early this year.

The written conference report stated:

EARLY HEARINGS

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika Reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoals Reservoir, Savannah River.

But the chairman of House conferees and of the House subcommittee which handled that bill gave the complete verbal understanding in his report to the House on October 12, 1962, when he said:

We recognize that the basin authorizations must be taken up early next year. With the consideration of the basin authorizations we are going to take up the Duke Power project, the Trotters Shoals project, along with, if I may say, the Devil's Jump project, the Knowles project, the Flint River project, the Cape Fear project, the Burns Creek project, and the Waurika project, along with the basins. We have promised and reduced it to writing in the conference report that early in January we will have further hearings in order to bring them out to the floor in advance of any consideration that the Appropriations Committee will give to these projects in the late spring or early summer.

That is a direct quotation by the chairman of the conference.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe last year a project of the Duke Power Co. was added on the floor of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Trotters Shoals project was added.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Duke Power Co. is a private corporation which was authorized to build the project.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Duke power project was added in the House. The Trotters Shoals project was added in the Senate.

Does that answer the Senator's question in regard to that portion of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is it not true that when the bill came from the Senate committee the item was in the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct. The Trotters Shoals project was in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Since then the Duke Power Co. has signified that it does not wish to go forward with building the dam; is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not have that information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do. I have a letter from them stating they do not care to go forward with the building of the dam this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. The committee did not have that information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is the reason why the item is not in the bill. That is what I wished to bring out.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was at their own request. They are furnishing their own money. They ask that it not be included this year. Is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. I think that is true. This is the portion which was put in by the House, and not by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They wrote to me and gave me the information that they did not want it this year. I think they will want it in the future.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, thus the Senate accepted the House position of eliminating the Senate-added projects—with the full understanding that the House agreed to hold hearings early and report a bill.

The House did, in fact, hold hearings this year.

But not until June 24 did the House adopt a river basin measure—and that one contained only increased authorizations for current programs, the very authorizations which were taken out of last year's measure.

As for the new projects which the Senate included last year, not a one was included.

Recognizing the need for prompt action, a meeting of the Public Works Committee was called 7 days after receiving the bill from the House, but because of the July 4 recess we were unable to obtain a quorum.

The earliest date at which the committee could meet to act was July 17.

We are handling this measure within 4 weeks after receiving it from the House, despite a lengthy recess. It took the House nearly 6 months to send the bill to us.

The bill we received from the House called for authorizing additional appropriations of $784 million for 11 basin projects.

The Public Works Committee determined after consultation with the Corps of Engineers that three of these projects need no money for fiscal year 1964, and that the remainder need only $161 million for 1964.

The decision of the committee was to reduce the authorizations to the amounts needed for fiscal year 1964, in order to have the time next year to review these continuing projects to determine what their proper future should be. We did not take time to review them this year.

It was then the judgment of the committee to amend the bill further by adding those projects which the Senate adopted last year, and by including two small, new projects which are basically technical corrections of continuing work.

The Senate additions totalled $448,547,000, and are $175 million under the House figure.

The projects which the Senate added, with estimated cost, are:

Cape Fear River Basin	$25,143,000
Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C.	78,700,000
Flint River, Ga.	63,200,000
Dardanelle lock and dam, Ark.	404,000
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla.	25,100,000
Missouri River Bank Stabilization	3,000,000
Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn.	151,000,000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont.	50,000,000
Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho	52,000,000
Total	448,547,000

New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., estimated cost, $25,143,000, benefit-cost ratio 2.5. This project will provide needed flood control and will augment low stream flows along the main stem of the Cape Fear River, and provide a valuable water supply for municipal and industrial use.

Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C., estimated cost $78,700,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.54. This project provides optimum development of the water resources between Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam, and is needed to serve effectively the future power load of the area, and for increased demands for recreation facilities.

Flint River, Ga., plan provides ultimately for five reservoirs for multiple purposes in the basin. Only one, Spewrell Bluff Reservoir, is authorized in this bill. Estimated cost $63,200,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.2. This reservoir is to be undertaken as the initial step in the development for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and allied purposes.

Dardanelle lock and dam modification, Arkansas, estimated cost $404,000, to provide Federal payment for relocation of sewage facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark., necessitated by construction of this multiple-purpose project on the Arkansas River.

Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., estimated cost $25,100,000, benefit-cost ratio 1.9, multiple-purpose project for flood control, water supply, recreation, and other purposes in a semiarid area, with incidental irrigation feature. Over 50 percent of the cost of the project will be repaid by local interests.

Missouri River bank stabilization, estimated cost $3 million. Technical amendment to permit correction of severe bank caving below Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., caused by degradation,

caused by power releases from the reservoir, causing loss of valuable farm land.

Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn., estimated cost $151 million, benefit-cost ratio 1.2. Multiple-purpose dam and reservoir for power, flood control, and other purposes on Big South Fork of Cumberland River. Needed for development of the water resources of the Cumberland River Basin.

Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., total estimated cost $247 million, benefit-cost ratio 1.3. This bill authorizes an initial amount of $50 million for partial accomplishment. This is a major unit of the plan for the Columbia River Basin, and is essential for development of the water resources of that basin.

Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, estimated cost $52 million, benefit-cost radio 1.7. Snake River is one of the major tributaries of the Columbia River. Floods damage residential and commercial property and irrigated land. Additional conservation of water for multiple uses is urgently needed.

These projects have been studied by the Corps of Engineers, who have found them feasible and have recommended them.

They have been studied by the Senate, which has found them feasible and adopted them.

They have been studied by the House Public Works Committee, which has taken no action on them.

They are called controversial, but will be no less controversial next year, or the year after.

The question is not controversy but feasibility. These are feasible projects which would serve the best interests of the people, and should be adopted.

I hope this will serve as a brief explanation of the position of the Committee on Public Works. We understand there are some amendments to be offered when the bill is considered tomorrow. We are prepared to proceed with consideration, according to the unanimous-consent agreement reached earlier today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment which was submitted to the Senate in behalf of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, which we have discussed with the chairman of the committee. I believe an agreement can be reached and that it can be disposed of in a short time, without the necessity for a rollcall vote. If it pleases the chairman of the committee, the Senate could consider that amendment at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think first we must consider the necessity of agreeing to the committee amendments, prior to consideration of other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then I have no objection to considering the other amendment at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my explanation will be brief. I invite the attention of the Senate to the final proviso in H.R. 6016, which I mentioned briefly the other day when I was discussing the possibility that the proposed legislation might be brought to the attention of the Senate. Since that time I have conferred with a number of Senators from the Missouri River Basin States and with the chairman of the committee, and we believe our objection to the bill can be taken care of by a simple amendment, which is printed and on the desks of Senators, identified as amendment No. 142. I shall read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

On page 9, starting on line 11, strike out the words *"Provided,* That no part of the funds authorized" and the remainder of the sentence down to and including "by Act of Congress" on line 16. Insert a period after the word "Interior" on line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, starting on line 11, it is proposed to strike out the words *"Provided,* That no part of the funds authorized" and the remainder of the sentence down to and including "by Act of Congress" on line 16. Insert a period after the word "Interior" on line 11.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to leave intact the good work of the Committee on Public Works in the Senate, insofar as it proceeds to authorize new projects, and so far as the full text of the bill is concerned. It would also leave intact the existing arrangement and prevailing authorizations, which in the main were made in 1944 and 1946 in the Flood Control Acts, as amended at that time, wherein most of the presently authorized units in the Missouri River Basin were authorized, which have been printed in Senate Document No. 191.

These projects in the main were authorized under terms of the Pick-Sloan plan, which brought together a marriage between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of the Army for the development of major dams on the main stem of the Missouri River, in the Missouri River Valley, and on its various tributaries in the nine States which represent the Missouri River Basin.

The projects which are of especial concern to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, and other Senators from this area, do not involve the big multiple-purpose main stem dams, which necessarily must be authorized by Congress specifically and identified as such, but are the smaller supporting projects authorized by previous legislation.

We do not feel that the Congress should at this time in one fell swoop deauthorize all these projects.

I suggest there are a great many of these projects, some of which are moving forward and some of which are completely dormant. In my own State of South Dakota there are 15 such projects which would be deauthorized by the present language of this bill. For the purpose of identifying them, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the projects in my own State which fall in this category.

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

SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECTS REQUIRING REAUTHORIZATION IF H.R. 6016 PASSES UNAMENDED

Compilation of units in S. Doc. 191 which, on the basis of current planning, are known to have a high degree of identifiability with original plan

Identity		Estimated cost		Acreage		Kilowatts		Reservoir capacity		State
S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	S. Doc. 191	Present	
1. Fort Randall Unit [1]	Crazy Horse unit	$75,000	$137,000	900	500					South Dakota.
2. Culdesac unit	Culdesac unit	395,000	2,902,000	5,660	5,400					Do.
3. Fort Thompson unit	Fort Thompson unit	551,000	2,825,000	7,710	7,500					Do.
4. Big Bend unit	Grass Rope unit	580,000	1,355,000	8,520	4,300					Do.
5. Greenwood unit [1]	Greenwood unit	217,000	1,608,000	4,210	4,900					Do.
6. Red Cloud unit	Iron Nation unit	162,000	906,000	1,850	1,700					Do.
7. Joe Creek unit	Joe Creek unit	509,000	2,356,000	6,560	4,400					Do.
8. La Roche unit	La Roche unit	194,000	1,143,000	2,720	1,800					Do.
9. Rousseau unit	Rousseau unit	305,000	1,380,000	3,310	2,200					Do.
10. Tower unit [1]	Tower unit	105,000	444,000	2,130	2,000					Do.
11. Yankton unit [1]	Yankton unit	156,000	438,000	2,390	1,100					Do.
12. Belle Fourche pumping	Belle Fourche pump	276,455	1,003,000	5,030	5,000					Do.
13. Rapid Valley irrigation										
14. Shadehill irrigation										
15. Pine Ridge irrigation										

[1] 15 projects total; 4 subject to feasibility studies currently.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter received by me from Commissioner Dominy, under date of July 25, 1963, in response to a telephone request I made of him on July 24, in which he analyzes and identifies and lists the number of projects of this type which are presently authorized in the Missouri River basin.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1963.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: In response to your telephone request of July 24, 1963, we enclose two tabulations which, when taken together, represent a listing of those units of the Missouri River basin project now considered to be economically justified and which were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended. Although the tabulations do not group the units by States, we have indicated the location of each unit in the right-hand margin of the several sheets.

Analysis of the tables, as thus amended, shows that the several units are distributed by States as follows:

Colorado	2
Kansas	2
Montana	53
Nebraska	3
North Dakota	13
South Dakota	15
Wyoming	17

In addition to the units shown on the attached tabulation, there are potential irrigational developments on the Shadehill and Rapid Valley units on which construction has been initiated in the form of dam and reservoir storage facilities.

Sincerely yours,
FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

Mr. MUNDT. It will be seen that there are 13 specific projects in South Dakota. In the final paragraph of Mr. Dominy's letter he said:

In addition to the units shown on the attached tabulation, there are potential irrigation developments on the Shadehill and Rapid Valley units on which construction has been initiated in the form of dam and reservoir storage facilities.

This totals 15 South Dakota projects which would be deactivated by H.R. 6016 as presently written.

In my own State, as is true in other States in the Missouri River basin, many of the presently authorized projects have not been studied to the point where there is any imminent likelihood of expenditure of funds so far as construction is concerned, but in all these areas are some that since 1944 have moved forward to the period when we can look forward to early construction. There are four such projects in South Dakota: Fort Randall unit, Greenwood unit, Tower unit, and Yankton unit, on which considerable work has been done. We are hopeful construction can soon be ordered on these if the feasibility studies so justify.

I am sure it is not the purpose of the Senate Public Works Committee, which has moved forward on the development of the natural resources of this country elsewhere, to stop authorization for commendable projects, and to rule out by general language all of these previously authorized projects in the Missouri River basin.

So the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have joined in this amendment, which would delete the language which would have the effect of completely decapitating and deactivating a host of worthwhile projects in the Missouri River basin.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Technically, section 2 on page 9 of the bill, dealing with the Missouri River basin, is not a Public Works Committee matter.

This is a reclamation project, which properly is under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and thus the Interior Committees of the House and Senate.

Its legislative history indicates that it first was offered as H.R. 5312, which was favorably reported to the House by the House Interior Committee. However, when H.R. 6016 was before the House on June 24, the language of H.R. 5312 was offered as an amendment to H.R. 6016.

According to the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 11417—the chairman of the House Interior Committee said he was authorized to offer the amendment. The amendment was adopted by the House without further debate.

The senior Senator from South Dakota stated in the Chamber Wednesday that this section was "highly controversial," and he would fight to the death to defeat the entire bill, if necessary.

I would like to state for the record that for something so "highly controversial," it is a little strange that the Senate discussion on Wednesday was the first time the issue has been raised.

From the time the bill was received in the Senate Public Works Committee on June 25, until July 24, no protest had been lodged with us. And, if I may repeat, the House debate, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indicates the language was adopted without the slightest opposition in that body. Thus, we on the Senate Public Works Committee had no reason to believe the matter was so highly controversial.

I state these facts simply to clear the record. I do not mean to suggest that the matter is not controversial or that the opponents do not have meritorious arguments. I think perhaps there is merit in the arguments.

For that reason, I am prepared to accept this amendment to that section so that we may bring the matter before the conference committee.

The Senator refers to section 2, page 9, of the bill, which, it will be noted, deals only with new projects. It would not affect currently authorized projects covered in prior sections of the bill. This means new projects.

Mr. MUNDT. These projects would be affected by the last two lines, which read "which is not hereafter authorized by act of Congress." That language would have the effect of deactivating projects not included in this bill which were authorized previously.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would not have any affect on the next omnibus bill that would be before Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course not.

Mr. McNAMARA. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for offering the amendment. Second, I commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the bill for the explanation he has given. I believe, on the basis of the debate up to this time, a question has been raised; and, in my opinion, the initiative undertaken by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota could well resolve this question by the acceptance of the amendment for the deletion of the last proviso in the bill before the Senate, beginning on line 11 and concluding on line 16.

I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has acceded to the request of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Let me say to my genial friend from Michigan that, as he well knows, as an experienced and mature legislator, controversial issues develop only after those intimately acquainted with the problem are advised as to what has been done. He knows that sometimes legislation is passed in either House when many Members are not on the floor. I presume, on the House side, when the language was adopted, many of those from the Missouri River basin area which is vitally interested in it were not present. In all events, I first studied this bill when it came out of the Senate Committee on Public Works—since I am not a member of that committee—and it immediately became controversial with me and I then announced on the floor of the Senate that if my amendment were defeated I would fight its passage with all of the parliamentary tools at my command.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does the Senator from South Dakota know what the Interior Department's position is on this vital matter?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I do not want to suggest what it is although I presume, being interested in developing these projects, it would be happy to see them continued.

Mr. McNAMARA. At any rate, if the Senate adopts the amendment, it will properly be before the conference and we can go into it at that time.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and if the Senator agrees that he will not fight the amendment, I suggest that it be adopted by voice vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct that this amendment, and in fact the entire

section of the bill, section 2, relates to no truly public works projects to be performed by the Corps of Engineers, but relates wholly and solely to reclamation projects?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do this amendment and this provision of the bill refer to the so-called Pick-Sloan omnibus authorization that was passed some 18 or 19 years ago?

Mr. MUNDT. Many of the authorizations were in the Pick-Sloan bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that at that time 300 or more projects were included under the single Pick-Sloan authorization usually with so little consideration that there were one-line authorizations for each project, with the total running to hundreds of millions of dollars of Government spending?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know how many there were. I think the original authorizations were reduced to about 100, and they have since been winnowed down considerably.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Last year, I recall, the question of the Glen Elder project arose. I thought it was bad, to deal with this $60 million project on the basis of a one-line authorization 18 years old. I feel very strongly that, if there is any language in the bill to stop that kind of omnibus authorization of huge amounts of the taxpayers money, there should be an opportunity for fuller consideration. I feel that would be appropriate in view of the fact that a top staff member of the Public Works Committee has told me that the committee already has approved everything in the Pick-Sloan project that is likely to be funded in the future.

Mr. MUNDT. I can say to the Senator that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana and myself is adopted and the status quo prevails, it does not mean that any agency of the Government can go ahead automatically.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would have to go before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. They would still have to be cleared with the Appropriations Committees and by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And they have to be approved legislatively, as well.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct for some of them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that the purpose of the amendment is to provide that we would not have to go through the careful authorization process before the Interior Committee that studies the merit of this spending endeavor but only rely upon the Appropriations Committees. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. A great many projects included within Pick-Sloan have involved multiple-purpose reservoirs worthy of being reauthorized by both committees. Our amendment prevents the automatic deauthorization of the minor projects which have been authorized and on which progress is being made with respect to feasibility studies and engineering studies and with respect to which we are looking forward to ultimate construction. Even then, however, these would have to be reconfirmed and reapproved by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have great respect and admiration for the Senator from South Dakota. He is an extraordinarily able man. Without any personal feelings in this situation, let me say that I wish to be recorded as voting against the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the amendment to strike any language which may appear to repeal Missouri basin authorizations, or to set a precedent for wholesale deauthorizations. If there are projects authorized which are not now advisable, Congress should be informed of them, and of the changes in Missouri basin conditions, or development plans, which makes deauthorization advisable. We should act only with full knowledge of the projects on which we are taking action, and the reasons for such action in each case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Montana and the Senator from South Dakota. Such wholesale deactivation and discontinuance of worthy and authorized projects, I believe, would be as bad as anything that has been suggested by any of the committees involved.

Passage of H.R. 6016 is important from a national point of view, as far as the Columbia basin is concerned. The inclusion in this omnibus authorization bill of a substantial program of development will put other water resource development projects in the pipeline for construction.

At the present time the major project authorized and not under construction in the Columbia basin is Libby. The Libby project is stalled by negotiations with Canada on the ratification of the Columbia River Treaty. Negotiations are going forward and it is possible that they will be successfully completed before the end of the year, thus clearing the way for immediate construction of Libby. In that case there will be no further major authorized projects and water resource development in the Columbia basin will grind to a halt. If the negotiations are not satisfactory then the need for additional storage facilities is even more urgent and important.

Passage and approval of H.R. 6016 will complete the work done last year when Bruces Eddy and projects in the Willamette basin were authorized. It will provide for planned and continuous development in the next few years so that planning can go forward while construction is underway on Bruces Eddy and on Libby if suitable agreement is reached with Canada. The passage of H.R. 6016 as amended will assure continuous development of important multiple-purpose water resource projects all over the United States.

The inclusion of Knowles Dam in western Montana is an example. Construction of this multipurpose flood control, recreation, and power project will benefit an entire area. When Knowles is completed, together with storage at Bruces Eddy and Canadian storage developed as a result of the Columbia River Treaty, we will have a storage capacity on the Columbia of 26,400,000 acre-feet. This approaches the flood control goal set for the Columbia and its tributaries by the Corps of Engineers.

For a generation the Montana Power Co. has consistently come in with an alternative proposal to development of this reach of the Flathead River every time Congress came to grips with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. When there is a possibility for authorization the Montana Power Co. becomes eager to build low-head run of the river dams. When the Montana Power Co. campaign is successful and development at the Knowles or Paradise site is halted, then the company forgets all about its proposal.

Now, at this time, I want to reiterate a position that I have always taken on water resource development of America's rivers.

Projects that are single purpose and for power production without storage can best be constructed by the private power companies. The multiple-purpose projects that have public interest uses over and above those of power production can best be constructed by the Federal Government. To use the symbols of private and public power—there is room for both Willy Wired Hand and Reddy Kilowatt in the power business.

President Kennedy has taken the same position. Meeting with the Committee for Economic Development, and in response to a question from the president of the Montana Power Co., President Kennedy said:

> If a private company can develop a site and provide a service more satisfactorily than the Federal Government, then the private company should go ahead. Indeed, as I said, I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove either that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it, before I would support the project.

In accordance with those standards Knowles Dam should be authorized by this Congress.

Such a policy justified construction of Cabinet Gorge and Noxon Rapids Dams by private companies further down the river. But neither the Montana Power Co. nor any other private company has proposed to developed a dam at the Knowles or Paradise site of multiple use. This is no situation analogous to High Mountain Sheep where the question is public or private construction of the same dam. This is a question of a private proposal to inadequately use the resource

against a public construction for full and complete use.

The record shows that the Montana Power Co. has, and for 43 years, failed to follow through on its stated goal of construction of run-of-the-river dams at the Buffalo Rapids sites.

President Wilson signed the Federal Water Power Act into law on June 10, 1920. Nine days later, in docket No. 5 in the Federal Power Commission files, the Rocky Mountain Power Co., a subsidiary of Montana Power Co., applied for a preliminary permit on five power sites on the Flathead River, including the two now suggested by the company. The FPC voted suspension of the application until receipt of a report of a commission appointed to investigate the Columbia basin project. In 1928 the Rocky Mountain Power Co. applied for a license on only one of the sites. This license was approved and Kerr Dam was constructed.

In 1953, in FPC docket No. 2135, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at the Buffalo Rapids site 4 miles downstream from Polson. It was issued in 1954. It was extended in 1955. It was extended again in 1956, then allowed to lapse.

In 1954, in FPC docket No. 2163, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at Buffalo Rapids No. 2, 10 miles below Polson. It was issued in 1955. It was extended in 1956. It too was allowed to lapse.

In 1954, in FPC docket No. 2164, the Montana Power Co. applied for a preliminary permit at Buffalo Rapids No. 4, 19 miles below Polson. In 1955 the permit was issued. In 1956 the permit was extended. It too was allowed to lapse.

Then in November 1960 the Confederated Kootenai and Salish Tribes applied for preliminary permits on Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4. This prompted the company again, in March 1961, to apply for a preliminary permit in the same two sites.

I suggest that this record, spanning almost a half a century, does not reflect a great desire on the part of the company to develop these inferior sites. Rather, it suggests to me a desire to prevent development by either the Federal Government or the Indian tribe which has a considerable stake in this river's development.

The authorization of Knowles will permit the Secretary of Interior to begin negotiations with the Salish-Kootenai Tribe for the value of the power sites and tribal lands inundated. During the hearings last year before the Senate Public Works Committee and this year before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, the Salish-Kootenai tribal council presented its own plan for development of the damsites located on the Flathead Indian reservation. An interesting sidelight in the statement presented by the engineers for the Flathead Tribe is the following observation "It should be noted that, very shortly after the tribes' filing for a preliminary permit on these sites with the U.S. Federal Power Commission, the Montana Power Co.—which had previously and some years past held a preliminary permit but had allowed it to lapse—filed an application for a construction permit on these same sites with the Commission. Both filings are pending determination by the Commission at this time." So the Indians, too, have observed the dog-in-the-manger tactics of the Montana Power Co.

But the Secretary of Interior is without authority to negotiate with the tribes unless and until Congress authorizes construction of Knowles.

One method of compensation suggested at the hearing was the reservation of a block of power for a perpetual income for the tribe, allowing the tribe to take advantage of its tribal assets by using such a block of power to attract industry to or near the reservation and providing additional economic opportunities for members of the tribe and nearby communities. It may be that a combination of outright payment and power reservation, or some other provision, will be the ultimate result of such negotiations. But until there is authorization these negotiations cannot begin.

In connection with the discussion of the Salish-Kootenai Tribe, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter written by Mrs. S. R. Logan, of Charlo, Mont., under date of March 11, 1963, which explains this matter in much greater detail than I have.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. METCALF. The subject of reservation of a block of power for the Salish-Kootenai Tribe brings up the other important negotiation that will come about as a result of authorization in this bill. That is a power reservation for Montana.

If all or part of the tribal compensation consists of setting aside a block of power, then such block may be all or part of the at-site power reservation for the State of Montana that Senator MANSFIELD, Representative OLSEN, and I have specified must be a part of the agreement for final construction. However, other alternatives open up with this authorization.

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced a bill earlier today, of which I have become a cosponsor, and with which I agree in principle, that provides for a power reservation for Montana at all Federal projects. The enactment of this measure would solve the question of a power reservation without further legislation on that subject. Such power reservation is justified for upstream States for a variety of reasons that have been frequently cited on the floor of the Senate.

If the suggestion that general legislation favoring the claim of upstream States for a priority of use for a block of power in return for the storage benefits provided is not adopted then it will be necessary, as was done at Hungry Horse to write such a special authorization legislation or make a provision therefore in the appropriation bill.

In closing I can do no better than quote Mrs. S. R. Logan, in her testimony before the House Committee on Public Works:

The choice is clear:

Three million acre-feet of flood control storage versus none, with the present $38 million annual flood damage potential increasing to $51 million as flood plains become more heavily populated.

Two hundred fifty-six thousand kilowatts of installed capacity at site and 686,000 kilowatts at 17 downstream dams; 7 Federal, 10 non-Federal, versus 240,000 kilowatts of installed capacity at site and no incremental power downstream. A lesser amount if the Canadian treaty is ratified, but still three times as much as Montana Power Co.'s alternative.

Abundant low-cost power, versus limited supply with the prospect of continued high rates.

Opportunity for Montana to raise its per capita income by increasing employment in manufacturing, versus a far slower rate of change from our present dependence on extractive industries.

Provision of additional power to supply growing demands of 8 private utilities and 19 industries plus new potential customers of B.P.A. versus discrimination against the many and favoritism to one utility.

Full development of the river for the benefit of Montana and the Northwest, versus partial development guaranteeing perpetual waste.

President Kennedy said, when he congratulated Bonneville Power Administration on its 25th birthday:

"When you build a region, you build your nation.

And in the President's tribute to Senator George Norris, he said:

Let us all * * * resolve that we, too, in our time will build a better Nation for generations yet unborn.

This bill will carry out President Kennedy's declaration and will result in an investment for a region, and a better Nation for generations yet unborn.

EXHIBIT 1

CHARLO, MONT., *March 11, 1963.*

Rev. HAROLD E. FEY,
Editor, the Christian Century, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR REVEREND FEY: In order to indicate the point of view from which I am writing, may I state at the outset that from January 1913 to July 1919 I was the first superintendent of the 600-square-mile school district which included a majority of the Flathead Indians. I was a friend, and for a time a tenant, of Antoine Moiese, a descendent of the Moiese who journeyed to St. Louis to ask the Black Robes to come to his people.

We completely integrated the Indian children with all the other children in the public schools, one of the first school districts to do so. When John Collier was Indian Commissioner under Secretary of the Interior Ickes, this reservation, with the assistance of my old friend, John Holst, of the Indian Bureau of Education, was the first to adopt a constitution for self-government as a unit of the American system. It has long been considered one of the best educated Indian groups.

While I was superintendent of the Winnetka, Ill., public schools I was a faithful reader of the Christian Century, which was always on the side of the people, and took the long view, always opposed to monopoly, dictatorship and brainwashing practices. I was honored by the friendship of its editor, Paul Hutchinson and his family. Since my

retirement I do not see it regularly. It is therefore particularly distressing to me when just today I read your editorial heatedly denouncing the Knowles Dam.

Obviously the editorial was based on inadequate and inaccurate information. My association with my friend, Father Byrne, to whom it referred, and with leaders and members of the Confederated Tribes, leads me to believe that they would not agree fully with your statement of the case.

I know that many of the Indians who have studied the matter strongly support the Knowles project because they believe it is in the best interest of all of the Indians, both as members of the tribes and as citizens of Montana and the United States.

Primarily the controversy is a tug of war between the Montana Power Co., which wants partial, no-storage and extremely wasteful dams at Buffalo Rapids tribal sites, which would preclude full, multipurpose development, and a Federal dam at Knowles, one of the three remaining storage sites on the Columbia River in the United States. What Knowles would accomplish will be discussed later.

Though the tribal council passed a resolution "unalterably" opposing Knowles, it appears they are really less interested in who builds what dam, or whether it is full Federal development in the interest of all the people or an extension of private monopoly, than they are in who will pay them most in settlement of their claims. Walter Morigeau, chairman of the tribal council, made this clear at the hearing in Washington on the project last September.

"Senator FONG. From your statement just made, I get the impression that if negotiations were entered into prior to the authorization of this project, and, in looking at your statement, that if you were assured that you would be compensated for tribal values, a substantial part of the objection of the tribal council would be dissipated?

"Mr. WALTER MORIGEAU. That is true.

"Senator FONG. Is that correct?

"Mr. WALTER MORIGEAU. That is true.

* * * * *

"Senator METCALF. If you were convinced, in order to bring out what I think Senator FONG was aiming at, if you were convinced that the best deal for the Indians was to get a block of power reserved and Knowles Dam built, you would be for Knowles?

"Mr. WALTER MORIGEAU. If it proved to be a better deal than two and four would be."

There appears to be little desire among the Indians to try to build the dams themselves. Hiring an engineer to report on such a possibility was apparently designed to strengthen their bargaining power. The engineering proposal can scarcely be considered a serious one. For example, the engineer who reported on the four-small-dam alternative, said it could be built very cheaply. But he did not include the cost of relocating the railway, highway, and other utilities which constitute nearly half the cost of the Knowles project, and which would be required for the four-dam alternative.

Section 7 of the Federal Power Act states that in order to grant a license for a dam the Commission must be convinced the project is: "best adapted to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region, if it be satisfied as to the ability of the applicant to carry out such plans."

Licensing of the small, Buffalo Rapids dams would be a more shocking violation of this basic principle of river development and the principles of conservation enunciated by Theodore Roosevelt than was the licensing of the Idaho Power Co. dams to the exclusion of Federal Hells Canyon, for the reason that the Idaho Power project did provide some storage, whereas dams at Buffalo Rapids would provide none. They would penalize both Indians and whites and the whole Northwest and the Nation by precluding flood control, recreation and cheap power. Knowles would produce six times as much power, which would be sold through the Bonneville marketing system at its postage stamp rate.

Senator METCALF stated categorically at the hearings last fall that settlement of Indian claims would be made by negotiation, not by condemnation. I am sure that the Indians would receive more pay in power and/or cash settlement from the Government than they could hope for through some sort of deal with the power company, which is concerned with profits only. The company's interest in Buffalo Rapids dams is limited to the goal of defeating or delaying Knowles to keep competition from cheap power (wholesale only) out of its territory.

You refer to the treaty of 1855, implying that the tribes' best interest is to see that it is carried out to the letter. I submit that this is a backward view. The tribes' interests will be better served by considering all the alternatives for the present and the future. There are four:

(1) Maintenance of the status quo: Lake County is a depressed area. The situation was so bad it was one of two counties selected for a special economic study by the State college several years before the Area Redevelopment Act was passed. It was one of the first to be designated a depressed area after the passage of the act.

The problem of unemployment is at least as serious for Indians as for whites. There is general agreement that industry with year-round payrolls is needed.

(2) Construction of Buffalo Rapids run-of-river-dams by Montana Power Co.: These dams would pay taxes and would to that extent assist county government. However, there has been one company dam in Lake County since 1939 and it has done little to improve economic conditions. It employs 16 men, and its rates are too high to attract industry. Contrast the 1.67 mills per kilowatt-hour paid by Anaconda Aluminum Co. to Bonneville, which markets power from Hungry Horse, with the 5 to 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour which Anaconda Copper Co. pays to Montana Power.

True, the company does pay the Indians rent for Kerr Dam site. But they are not as "ready and willing" to pay it as their publicity would lead one to believe. In 1954 the company installed a third generator at Kerr Dam, enabled to do so by storage from newly constructed Federal Hungry Horse Dam. The Indians claimed additional rent for the third generator, but the company refused to pay it. The Indians took their case to court and won, but the company appealed, so the tribes have had to incur the expense of long drawn out litigation to force the company to pay. The case was not finally settled until 1962. So the company's protestations of solicitude for the Indians' welfare must be scrutinized carefully, not taken at face value.

Most of the Indians fear entanglements with the company, and with good reason. Entanglements would most probably ensue if Knowles is not authorized.

(3) Construction of Buffalo Rapids dams by the tribes: If Knowles fails of authorization the tribes might conceivably succeed in getting a license to build the small dams, because the Federal Power Act gives preference to public bodies. (Sec. 7.) Possibly they could raise necessary funds through sale of revenue bonds and hire competent management. But how or where could they market their power?

They could use some of it on the reservation to establish industries of their own, or attract new industry set up by others. For the rest would they not be "captive" to Montana Power Company which has the only transmission lines? Canyon Ferry, a Federal dam across the Continental Divide is just such a captive dam. The company has the only transmission line. It buys power at ridiculously low rates at the dam and sells it at its own high rates at Helena, only a few miles away.

The company would have the tribes over a barrel.

(4) Knowles Dam: Knowles is required for flood control storage on the Columbia. Damage now averages $24 million annually. It will increase as population in the lower valley increases.

In 1948, 38 lives were lost. No one knows when the next great flood will occur, but that it will come is statistically predictable.

The Clark Fork-Pendoreille is a heavy contributor to floods, ranking only a few percentage points below the main stem of the Columbia and the Kootenai, and well above the Snake, Salmon or any other tributary.

Choice of sites: The Paradise site is better than Knowles because it would control two rivers with one dam. It has been ruled out by the Corps of Engineers because the cost of relocating two mainline railroads was prohibitive.

Knowles, about 7 miles upstream from Paradise, is the next best site, and economically feasible. It is on a "harnessed" stretch of the Flathead River: there are dams both above and below it. If Knowles is not authorized, flood control requirements will necessitate several dams farther upstream, in Glacier Park, the Bob Marshall Wilderness and the Upper Blackfoot.

If it were a question of wilderness versus Indians, I would say without question, "Sacrifice the wilderness." But I do not believe Knowles will hurt the Indians: rather it will help them.

Knowles and power: If the corps had not planned to include generating facilities at Knowles the dam would undoubtedly have been constructed long since. But Theodore Roosevelt said, back in 1903:

"It seems clear that justice to the taxpayers of the country demands that when the Government is or may be called upon to improve a stream the improvement should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable."

For many years this has been the accepted policy of both political parties. Now users of electricity, not taxpayers, pay for the portion of the cost of multipurpose dams attributable to power, and often subsidize a portion of irrigation costs as well.

Senator METCALF's article in the July issue of Public Power gives power statistics for Knowles and the Buffalo Rapids Dams. You will see that in addition to developing 267 megawatts at site, compared to only 148 megawatts at Buffalo Rapids, Knowles develops, at practically no additional cost, 686 megawatts at downstream dams, public and private alike, as shown on the Bonneville River chart. The Buffalo Rapids dams, because they create no storage, do not add a single kilowatt downstream. So the comparison is 953 to 148, or 6 to 1.

Montana Power Co. versus Knowles: Since it could buy power from the public dam more cheaply than it could generate power at Buffalo Rapids, why does Montana Power Co. oppose Knowles? It now buys 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville and has just signed a 30-year contract for 80,000 kilowatts from Hanford.

This is a question many of the company's stockholders might ask if they were aware of the fact. But this is one of the facts the company does not include in its propaganda.

The answer, I believe, is that the company has, by its own account, a 70-percent monopoly of electric distribution in the State of

Montana. Since it operates within the State only, its rates are subject to the Montana Railroad & Public Service Commission, but not to the Federal Power Commission. As in many other States, regulation by commission is a farce.

A look at the rate map prepared from Federal Power Commission rate schedules, shows that Montana Power has the highest rates of any utility in the Columbia River basin.

An article by Dr. Arnold Hirsch, a rate specialist, "Effective Rate Regulation: Fact or Fiction," shows that the largest private utility in Montana (Montana Power Co.) tops the list for the entire country in its rate of profits. His study was based on operating reports all utilities are required to file with the Federal Power Commission.

With the highest rates in the Northwest, and the highest rate of profit in the country, Montana Power does not want to be disturbed by competition. The example of Hungry Horse is clear and close at hand. Hungry Horse Dam is in the territory of Pacific Power & Light Co. When cheap power from Hungry Horse came on the line a few residents of Kalispell met to discuss the possibility of establishing a municipal distribution system. Before they could form a committee and hold a second meeting Pacific Power & Light Co. reduced its rates.

Montana Power is fighting to keep cheap power out of its territory by every device known to the power lobby. So far it has succeeded in keeping Montana one of only two States in which there is no municipal distribution of power.

Knowles and the Indian tribes: Why would Knowles be better for the Indians? They would be compensated for the value of their powersites in any case, and because Knowles is a bigger pie than any alternative, their slice would be larger.

In the case of Yellowtail Dam on the Crow Reservation, Indian grazing lands were valued at $47,000, but Congress negotiated a settlement of $2.5 million for the powersite values, granting in addition the right to sue for higher compensation, which the Crows are now doing. The Interior Department offered to pay part of this in a block of power but the Crows turned it down.

Senator METCALF indicated at the September hearing on Knowles that a block of power would be offered to the Confederated Tribes. Their attorney replied:

"Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has motivated the tribes is what is to their advantage, and it is even to their financial advantage to take power, because they have seen these charts of the Corps of Engineers showing the tremendous way in which the value of power is going up in years to come. If they are on a flat rental as they get from Montana Power Co., with inflation that money is worthless.

"If they have power, as we go necessarily to steam generation and ultimately to atomic generation, the value of that block of power will be enhanced greatly. And they are anxious, of course, to make the best deal for themselves that they can."

Senator METCALF also suggested a proviso that at least a part of this block be reserved for use on the Flathead Indian Reservation. Such a geographical reservation can be made only for a Federal dam: it would be constitutionally impossible for a privately owned dam.

Earlier in the hearing this exchange took place:

"Mr. CRAGUN. It seems to me that the Indians have some deep moral rights. And this, I think, is also perhaps an intangible that should be given weight.

"Senator METCALF. And it can and it should and it will."

During the morning session Mr. Cragun had stated: "I want to say that in my dealings with the Montana delegation I have been assured throughout that they recognize the tribal property and realize that it must be compensated."

The tribes' consulting engineer, Ivan Block, estimated generating costs for the Buffalo Rapids dams, if built by the Indians, at 4.17 mills per kilowatt-hour. The average price of Columbia River power marketed by BPA during 1962 was 2.36 mills per kilowatt-hour. This difference in price might well mean the difference between being able to attract industry and not being able to. As suggested under alternative 3, if the tribes built the small dams themselves, they might be left with more power than they could use or market on the reservation, and find themselves at the mercy of Montana Power Co.

In choosing between these four alternatives I have no hesitation in selecting Knowles as in the best interest of the Indians.

There is now severe unemployment on the Flathead Reservation, and something must be done to increase employment.

The tribes will be paid for the value of their powersites, and since the power developed by a Federal dam will be considerably cheaper and therefore more attractive to industry, I am convinced that the Indians will derive greater benefits from the Federal dam than from constructing the small dams themselves, or from renting their powersites to Montana Power Co.

In addition, the rest of the Northwest and the Nation will derive great benefits from Knowles, and would be harmed by extension of Montana Power Co.'s monopoly. The rights and welfare of these millions of non-Indians, in common with their Indian fellow citizens, also deserve to be considered.

Father Byrne, whom you mention, assisted me at various times in registering and persuading the Indians in his parish to vote. During our long drives together we seemed to be in full agreement, and at that time he did not seem to think Federal Knowles Dam a threat, but rather an opportunity for the Indians and their children to realize their aspirations more fully. That was before the tribal council decided to employ an engineer to help them establish an asking price for their claims. Like me, at that time he did see the power monopoly as a menace.

I believe that members of the tribes generally regard Senator LEE METCALF, Senator MANSFIELD, and Congressman OLSEN, all supporters of Knowles, as was the late Senator Murray, as their true friends and champions. Father Byrne also often expressed this belief to me. All three have recognized the Indians' right to settlement for their power sites, and have insisted that the claim should be settled by negotiation, not by condemnation.

COMMENTS ON SOME STATEMENTS IN YOUR EDITORIAL

You state, "Recreational facilities and property holdings along the shores of the low dam pools would have high value compared with Knowles." I live within 15 miles of the Buffalo Rapids sites, within 40 miles of the Knowles site. I know the terrain well. I cannot believe that anyone who has seen it could reach such a conclusion. This is one of the statements which occasioned my initial comment that your editorial is based on inadequate information. It is part of the company's propaganda put out for nonresident consumption.

The land above the Buffalo Rapids sites is low, flat, dry grassland. The only trees are in the river bottom and would be destroyed by the water.

In contrast, the reservoir created by Knowles would be 72 miles long. It would include, in addition to this flat treeless area a deep canyon winding between steep mountain walls, some bare and rocky, some covered with forests, for more than 30 miles upstream from the dam. Arms of the lake would reach up into side canyons. It is a much more picturesque section, more attractive for water-based recreation and tourists, than the upper portion. A transcontinental highway runs along the south shore.

The Indian reservation extends to within a short distance of the dam so that they would be able to take advantage of the best sites on this long and varied shoreline to develop tourist facilities. The tribes have already had experience in this field. They have built and operate a bathhouse at Hot Springs. And they have leased tribal property at Blue Bay on Flathead Lake to a private operator for a motel and lodge.

The opposition has made much of the "mudflat" argument against Knowles. Because it is a storage project it does have a seasonal drawdown. So does Hungry Horse Dam, and so does Flathead Lake. But both are fine recreation attractions. They are full during the summer recreation season just as Knowles would be. This is necessitated by the fact that they are operated as flood control projects to catch and hold destructive spring and early summer runoff, hold it until late fall and winter when normal riverflow is low, and then release it. The Columbia is fortunate in that, unlike many other areas, most of its water uses, including recreation, require the same water management schedule.

Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have estimated the recreation potential of the Knowles Reservoir as far greater than that of the Buffalo Rapids small pondage reservoirs. As you know, an act of 1958 now makes recreation one of the main purposes of Federal reservoirs, not just an afterthought. Since the tribes own a great deal of the shoreline they are in a position to benefit greatly.

Your editorial mentions that the area to be flooded is "essential to four Indian cattle associations." The minutes of the tribal council for July 12, 1962, show that though 4 associations would be affected, only 35 of the many Indians who raise cattle belong to these associations to which tribal grazing lands are leased. Furthermore, it has been reported to me by a member of the tribe that they pay rent of only $3,762. According to some of my Indian friends there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with this arrangement.

Nor is Indian dissatisfaction limited to favoritism in the matter of grazing lands. There is such widespread dissatisfaction and distrust of the council as presently constituted that a group calling itself the Flathead Kootenai Organization has sprung up. It claims membership of over 50 percent of the enrolled members of the tribes living on and in the vicinity of the reservation. Its president testified in favor of Knowles at the Washington hearing last September.

I am enclosing a folder put out by Montana Power Co. last spring. The company reported to the Federal Power Commission that it circulated 296,000 copies, more than enough to supply every family in the State. The mailing list included its customers in Montana and its stockholders throughout the country.

Senator METCALF found the material in the folder "so grossly misleading and erroneous" he felt obliged to comment on it in a speech on the Senate floor. A copy of this speech is also included so that you may compare the two.

Just as the company tried to win support for its small dams from wildlife enthusiasts with the false allegation that Knowles would destroy the Bison range, and from water users with the false charge that future water rights would be threatened by Knowles, in like manner it has undertaken to set friends of the Indians against Knowles by misrepresentation.

I believe the true interests of the Indians will be best served by a rational study of

present day alternatives and by patient and considerate negotiation.

Since Knowles Dam, an essential part of the full, all-purpose development of the great Columbia River, is of fateful importance to the entire Northwest, I urge you to have a competent person whose disinterestedness you can trust, study all sides of the several alternatives thoroughly before you arrive at conclusions.

Otherwise your position, ironically, may contribute to the defeat of your true desire to assist the Indians.

Sincerely yours,

S. R. LOGAN.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend my distinguished colleague for his ever-active interest in the development of the natural resources, not only of our State of Montana, but of our region of the Northwest, the Rocky Mountain area, and the Nation as a whole. His record has been consistent. In my opinion, he is one of the solid, sound, and great Senators of our generation. He does his homework; he knows whereof he speaks; and when he speaks, he is listened to.

Statements have been made about power development in western Montana and the Montana Power Co. The shining light, so far as we are concerned, is the Hungry Horse project, about which I should like to say a few words, not because it is in the bill; it is not. It has been authorized, money has been appropriated, it is operating, and it is providing a financial return to the Government.

I believe the RECORD should show that while the Montana Power Co. is opposed to Knowles Dam, as it was opposed to the Hungry Horse project in the Flathead country, because of Hungry Horse Dam the following has occurred:

First. The Montana Power Co. was able to install a 56,000-kilowatt generator at Kerr Dam on the Flathead River because of the storage facilities at Hungry Horse.

Second. The Montana Power Co., though opposed to the construction of Hungry Horse, has a 20-year contract, entered into in 1955, and it is my understanding that it is renewable every year—this statement is subject to correction—for 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power from Hungry Horse, which it buys at the rate of 2.5 mills and feeds into its own system to sell to its customers at a higher rate.

Third. The rates of REA's in western Montana have been reduced because of Hungry Horse power, from between 8 and 9 mills per kilowatt to 3.1 mills per kilowatt.

Fourth. Because of Hungry Horse, the Anaconda Co. built an aluminum plant at Columbia Falls, Mont., which at the present time employs around 600 persons. With the expansion of the plant, it is anticipated that several hundred more will be added.

Fifth. In Flathead County, where the Hungry Horse project is located, the assessed value of the county has increased from around $35 million to around $100 million.

Sixth. Because of Hungry Horse power, the Victor Chemical Co. of Silver Bow, between Butte and Anaconda, and other industrial facilities have come into western Montana.

Seventh. Because of these new industries, the tax base has been broadened rather than restricted, with the result that more people are paying more taxes to the counties in which these industries are located, to the State of Montana, and to the Federal Government.

Eighth. The repayment on the schedule of Hungry Horse is current, and over $35 million has been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

Ninth. Hungry Horse Reservoir has developed into a tremendous recreational and fishing area and has contributed to the well-being of thousands of our people not only from Montana but from over the Nationa as a whole.

Tenth. Nobody has been hurt by Hungry Horse because the county in which it is located, western Montana which it serves, the Montana Power Co., and the REA's have benefited.

Eleventh. The Hungry Horse is an investment in America for the benefit of the people of my State and Nation; is fully repayable, and it is anticipated that it will be paid out in 50 years or less.

Twelfth. Actually, structures of this type will produce power for hundreds of years, even after they are paid for, and should be looked on as assets, not as liabilities.

Thirteenth. A block of approximately 200,000 kilowatts of Hungry Horse power has been allocated to Montana—the first such preference ever made and one which I hope will be the pattern for all Federal projects in Montana in the future.

Mr. President, having that in mind, it was my privilege and that of my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to introduce once again a bill which would seek to place in Montana a priority or a preference, so far as power allocations are concerned, as it affects projects which are developed in our State on a multipurpose basis.

I join with my colleague in saying that so far as dams built only for the purpose of generating electricity are concerned, I believe private utilities should come first. But as to projects having a multipurpose effect, such as Knowles, Hungry Horse, Libby, and Yellow Tail, which is now under construction, whose uses will include recreation, flood control, reclamation, irrigation, as well as power, I think the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to the people.

If private power companies were willing to build multipurpose projects and give to the people the same benefits, I would favor the private power companies, not the Federal Government, building such projects.

I hope the bill will be passed. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. METCALF. I am grateful to my colleague from Montana for his comments. He has eloquently told the history of Hungry Horse Dam. It is a story that could be repeated over and over again with respect to the other multipurpose dams built in upstream States. It is essential to the development of the resources of the States in which these dams are located that at-site power reservations be provided.

I reiterate what my distinguished colleague has said: If Montana Power Co. or any other private power company will come before Congress and say that it will build a dam of the same quality and size so as adequately to fulfill the purposes of a multipurpose project, such as Knowles Dam will do, I will support it, just as my colleague has said he will support it. But Montana Power Co. has never come before Congress and asked to build Knowles Dam. It has always come before Congress with an insufficient, inadequate program of partial construction. We in the State of Montana can no longer afford to waste our resources.

So I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague, who is responsible—more than any other man in the Nation—for construction of the Hungry Horse Reservoir and the development of the area of western Montana to which he has referred. I am very grateful to him for drawing the analogy and making the comparison between Hungry Horse Dam and its development and the potentials which exist at Knowles.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the bottom of page 3 of House bill 6016, a Federal project known as the Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir is authorized to be constructed. This is a project to be located on the Savannah River, which is the border of South Carolina and Georgia, approximately halfway between two other existing Federal dams and reservoirs, Hartwell Dam and Clark Hill Dam. It is my intention today to voice the very strong objections of the people of South Carolina, and a great many in Georgia, who oppose construction of this third Federal dam. The Senate Public Works Committee, in amending House bill 6016 so as to include the authorization of this particular project, did so without the benefit of any hearings. Last year this item was added to the bill on the Senate floor without hearings, but was deleted in conference. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee has held no hearings on this project, either this year or previously. On the other hand, the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has held hearings on this project, and it has declined to act upon it favorably. At the House hearing, numerous individuals, testifying on behalf of themselves and local civic, business, and governmental bodies, voiced their very strong opposition to this project. The hearings which were held by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives were concluded earlier this year. However, Mr. President, they have only been printed in the last few days and, therefore, have not been available for public review and discussion. These are the only hearings from which the Senate might judge the issue, based upon the facts presented by the people and groups most closely concerned, that are available to us.

There are many strong and appealing reasons for the defeat of this proposal, and the proponents of it lack the factual arguments to sustain their position.

Earlier this year, the President of the United States delivered an address to the Committee for Economic Development. At the conclusion of his remarks, there was a question-and-answer period. In response to one question, President Kennedy said, as reported in the Wall Street Journal of May 10:

In deciding whether a specific damsite should be publicly or privately developed, "I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it, before I would support the project."

Judged in the light of this criteria which was announced by the President, this project should, by all means, be defeated. If this project is authorized and constructed, it would have a very adverse effect upon both South Carolina and Georgia and, indeed, the Nation. While this controversy was at first of only local significance, it is now attracting national attention. In the July 1963, edition of Nation's Business, an article, entitled "United States Undercuts Own Job-Making Goal," is devoted to this particular project. This is a very concise and to-the-point article, and I should like to read from it, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate:

[From Nation's Business magazine, July 1963]

UNITED STATES UNDERCUTS OWN JOBMAKING GOAL—WATER PROJECT POINTS UP CONFLICT IN POLICIES

The New Frontier, in its efforts to move ahead with vigor on many fronts, sometimes gives the impression that its left hand is unaware of what its right hand is doing.

A current example is arousing increasing attention in Congress and heated debate in two Southeastern States.

The Department of the Interior wants to build a $79 million Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River, which forms the boundary between South Carolina and Georgia.

Opponents contend that the dam would prevent $500 million in private industry from locating along the river, bringing with it jobs, payrolls, and tax revenue vitally needed in an area which includes more than nine counties classified as depressed by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Citing the proposed dam, Republican Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Public Works, says:

ECONOMIC VALUE OF ADDING TO EXISTING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IS QUESTIONED

"One of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. More than 4 million persons are unemployed. The administration wants to spend more money, establish more corps, build more public works, make more loans, establish more Federal agencies, add to the Federal payroll—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope.

"But much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made. When the New Frontier pushes some programs, you wonder about the sincerity of its efforts to cut unemployment."

Trotters Shoals, which would stem the Savannah River about 55 miles above Augusta, Ga., is part of an 11-dam plan approved by Congress in 1944 for Federal development of the river. Two of the dams have been built. The Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir lie at the southern end of the disputed 29-mile stretch of river, Hartwell Dam and Reservoir at the northern end. The reservoir formed by Trotters Shoals would flood 24,000 acres to bridge the gap creating a string of three lakes linked together by dams.

This remaining stretch of river between the two existing reservoirs is described as "the finest industrial area in the entire Southeastern United States" by Charles E. Daniel, board chairman of the Daniel Construction Co., an international industrial contracting firm located in Greenville, S.C.

EXPERTS SAY AREA IN DISPUTE IS SUITABLE LOCATION FOR PLANTS IN DISPUTE IS SUITABLE

"We have located eight major sites here suitable for large processing plants, and behind these plants would grow up supporting plants," Mr. Daniel says. "This area is blessed with a tremendous amount of free-flowing water. One of the largest natural gas lines in America crosses it. Equally large liquid petroleum lines cross it. There are two railroads and truck and air transportation. More important, there are many thousands of people on both sides of the river who desperately need jobs.

"My firm has 47 industrial prospects that want to build new plants in the Southeast. Every year it becomes more difficult to find sites such as this for plants which require a great amount of water. I confidently believe that we can have more than $500 million worth of industry along this stretch of river and in the supporting areas within the next 10 to 15 years.

"But if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built, it will knock out the possibility of the primary plants along the river and their satellite plants."

Gov. Donald S. Russell of South Carolina has spoken out in opposition to Trotters Shoals, and Georgia Gov. Carl E. Sanders says that he might alter his earlier approval of the dam if private development is an immediate probability. Congressional delegations from the two States are split.

In the light of growing opposition from the region involved and the apparent inconsistency with the administration's professed aims of boosting employment and encouraging industrial development of depressed areas, why is the Interior Department pushing for congressional authorization of Trotters Shoals?

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall says:

"The Southeast is one of the few areas where clean, fresh water is still available in substantial supply. In our judgment, the only prudent course is to develop and conserve these great water resources expeditiously and judiciously.

"This is a project with substantial power potential in an area where the preference customers need more power.

"Located between the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects, the three contiguous lakes will form a recreation complex of national significance.

"In addition, since this is developing into one of the great industrial areas of our Nation, abundant clean, fresh water will be available for municipal and industrial use."

WHAT ADVOCATES SAY

Supporters of the Trotters Shoals project contend that it would create jobs and strengthen the economy of the region by enhancing its recreational facilities and by attracting industry to the reservoir's water supply. Local business and civic leaders, however, point to the Clark Hill and Hartwell installations as evidence that this just doesn't happen.

"We judge the future by the past. The building of the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects has formed industrial deserts with thousands upon thousands of acres of water down the middle," declares E. H. Agnew of Starr, S.C., former president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation and a trustee of Anderson County School District No. 3.

"What we need is not more recreational facilities, but more jobs and more tax income for an expanding educational economic opportunity. It's the damage that Trotters Shoals would bring to the industrial and agricultural future of our area that really hurts. It hurts because it clouds the chances for economic progress and educational advancement. Our youth must be well trained. Training includes better schools. Better schools cost more money, and Trotters Shoals offers no money. Private industry does—it pays taxes."

The counties on both the South Carolina and Georgia sides of the Clark Hill Reservoir are listed as depressed, as are all of the Georgia counties extending up to the Hartwell Reservoir. These and other adjoining counties are suffering a constant loss of population as their residents, particularly young people, go elsewhere looking for jobs. Industrial development has not taken up the slack in employment created by the region's declining agriculture.

"My experience has been that water-using industries won't locate on a Federal reservoir," says Walter W. Harper, director of the South Carolina State Development Board. "No industrial development has resulted from either the Hartwell or Clark Hill projects. The proposed Trotters Shoals project cost the area at least one substantial industrial prospect because of the threat of a Federal dam."

McCormick County, which adjoins the Clark Hill Reservoir, is the single South Carolina county in this area listed as depressed. Frank E. Harrison, a McCormick attorney, says:

"Clark Hill has created tremendous problems that those of us who are trying to attract industry have spent a great deal of time attempting to overcome in the past 10 years. We fear that another reservoir will undo what progress we have made. When a corporation finds that it must get Federal approval to locate on the reservoir, it just moves on. The town of McCormick had to get a special act of Congress in order to buy water from Clark Hill.

"The recreational facilities offered by the reservoir haven't produced any jobs, either. The people that come to Clark Hill may spend a little money for gasoline, bait or food, but most of them come from less than 100 miles away and bring it with them."

THE VIEW FROM GEORGIA

On the Georgia side of the Clark Hill Reservoir, the picture is much the same. Harry C. Stewart, mayor of Lincolnton and an automobile dealer, describes it this way:

"Most of our timberland in Lincoln County was flooded by the lake. Our population is decreasing and per capita income is less than $900 a year, among the lowest in the State. The only commercial establishment produced in our county by Clark Hill is a fishing camp on the lake. It was built for $100,000 and has been sold three times, the last time for $40,000."

The situation at the more recently completed Hartwell project offers no more encouragement. No new industry can be cited which came because of the reservoir. In fact, one factory which was located there before the dam was built—the Utica-Mohawk plant of J. P. Stevens & Co.—is currently trying to recover damages estimated at $1.5 million as a result of the Federal installation.

James M. Stepp, a professor of agricultural economics at Clemson College who made a study of the Trotters Shoals project for the South Carolina State Development Board, offers this analysis:

"The most important test of any proposed resource development project is simply this: Will the net longrun effect of the project

be more and better jobs or fewer and poorer jobs for the people of the area? I am convinced that the net effect of the Trotters Shoals project would be to reduce both the quantity and quality of employment opportunities in South Carolina and Georgia.

"The proposed project would severely restrict and perhaps destroy the ability of the area near the reservoir to compete for the large group of industries known as wet-process industries."

Professor Stepp lists these factors: Existing sites would be flooded by the reservoir; industrial effluent must receive more costly treatment if discharged into a reservoir instead of a flowing stream; large water-using industries ordinarily provided their own water supply facilities and prefer river-bank sites where water rights are included in real estate property rights; uncertainty would result from the reservoir's control by a Federal agency which has no responsibility for local industrial development and is governed by policies and political pressures originating far from the area.

"Since World War II," Professor Stepp adds, "about 30 new wet-process plants have been built on the free-flowing portions of South Carolina's rivers, whereas only one has been built adjacent to a reservoir—and that reservoir is owned by the county in which the plant is located."

He points out that there are strong reasons for doubting claims that federally owned reservoirs on the middle Savannah River would form the basis for a tourist industry that would provide sizable employment. This could happen only if large numbers of tourists from other areas were persuaded to vacation there.

REA HAS A HAND

Because of the prospect of more Federal hydroelectric power from the dam for preference customers—Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives and municipal power facilities—a significant part of the support for Trotters Shoals has come from REA cooperatives. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., staff engineer and counsel of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, says:

"Power generated at Trotters Shoals would be marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina with priority to preference customers. REA-financed systems in those States now obtain wholesale power from Government dams, via the Southeastern Power Administration, and from investor-owned utility companies. The major portion of the energy purchased by the cooperatives comes from investor-owned utilities.

"Federal Power Commission estimates show that loads are doubling each 14 years in the area to be served by Trotters Shoals. If Federal power is to remain a significant factor in regulating wholesale rates in that area, it must continue to constitute an effective fraction of total capacity. This means new multiple-purpose reservoirs, and Trotters Shoals is among the best yet remaining undeveloped."

Local residents point out, however, that expanding power needs will be met by private enterprise if the obstacle of the proposed Federal dam is removed. Duke Power Co. of Charlotte, N.C., which supplies power to the region, owns a site on the river 8 miles below the Hartwell Dam and has long planned to build a large steam-generated powerplant there.

Congressional approval is needed for Duke to build a small dam to provide cooling water for the plant. A bill authorizing this construction died in the past session of Congress, and Duke was forced to change its plans and build new facilities in North Carolina to supply the pressing power needs of its customers.

"We still want to build a steamplant on the Savannah River," says William B. McGuire, president of Duke Power. "Since the postponement of the plant we have been making studies to determine when it will be possible for Duke again to include it in our plans. It now appears that Duke can economically use generation from the Savannah River plant beginning sometime during the period 1970–75."

Mr. McGuire adds, however, that the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam would flood the location of the small dam which Duke must build in connection with its plant. To surmount this problem, he says, "the practical and economic considerations would be so great that, as best we can now determine, we would not build the dam."

WHAT COMPARISONS SHOW

An interesting comparison of the relative merits of buying power from Duke or from REA cooperatives is provided by Mr. McGuire. In 1961 the average charge to residential customers of South Carolina REA cooperatives was 2.42 cents per kilowatt-hour; Duke's average charge was 1.95 cents.

The $210 million steamplant which Duke hopes to build on the Savannah would generate 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually in comparison with 471.4 million for Trotters Shoals Dam. Duke would pay annual taxes of $7.4 million to the Federal Government and $5.95 million to State and local governments, while Trotters Shoals would pay none. Yearly operating and payroll expenditures would be $3 million for Duke and $483,000 for the Federal installation. In addition, Duke would buy $24 million worth of coal each year from mines in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, States which also contain depressed areas. Trotters Shoals, being hydroelectric, would not require fuel.

Another major corporation which owns a plant site on the disputed section of the Savannah River is the Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, a manufacturer of paper and paper products with operations in 17 States. In 1956 Mead bought a 1,000-acre site on the river near Calhoun Falls. Since then it has invested $1 million in nearby timberlands and committed itself to an additional $2 million.

If Trotters Shoals is built, it would flood most of the Mead site and eliminate the free-flowing water needed for treatment of the effluent from the proposed plant.

"This would make an industrial development such as ours impossible," says Ford T. Shepherd, a Mead vice president. "We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment involved. However, this important decision can't be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for adequate treatment of our effluent. If Trotters Shoals is built we are dead.

"If we knew that Trotters Shoals was not in the picture, I think the only barrier would be economic conditions. Our planning indicates that we need additional capacity within 5 years."

The paper mill which Mead contemplates building would cost nearly $40 million and employ from 600 to 650 people with an annual payroll of about $5 million. The mill would require about $8 million worth of pulpwood each year, produced by 2,500 men working on the farms and forest lands outside the plant. It would pay Federal, State and local taxes of nearly $4 million.

A papermill would give the local economy an unusually strong boost. Unlike many manufacturing industries found in farm communities, a papermill makes use of a local natural resource. Cotton has declined sharply as a factor in the economy of the region, and much of the land has been planted in timber. Without a nearby mill, however, the pulpwood market has become increasingly depressed as the large coastal mills have come to depend largely on timber producers closer to them.

PRICE DEPRESSION THREATENS

"Unless a market in the form of a pulpwood consuming mill is soon provided, upper South Carolina faces a serious oversupply of pulpwood and this will lead to a depression of prices, farm income, commerce and land values," according to J. Wesley Hughes, manager of the Abbeville County [S.C.] Development Board.

Holcombe M. Verdery, Jr., a lumber dealer in nearby Harlem, Ga., says:

"A papermill would provide a market for timber, jobs for people required to harvest wood, and jobs for manufacturing personnel. It would stimulate the economy and provide a healthy business community, able and capable of paying more taxes. More taxes would provide better schools. Residents would be able to find work within commuting distance of their homes. Young people would have job opportunities. At the present time they have to look for work in distant cities."

Federal officials have questioned whether the plant proposed by Mead would be able to treat its effluent satisfactorily so that it would not contaminate the Clark Hill Reservoir downstream. Mr. Shepherd has assured Congressmen that it can do so.

Supporters of Trotters Shoals also have contended that the Federal project would not be incompatible with the Duke steamplant. However, as Governor Russell points out:

"The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers."

In the same manner, a significant number of government, business and civic leaders in South Carolina and Georgia feel that they cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Federal Government that the Trotters Shoals project will be good for their States or for the country.

Mr. President, I believe that a little economic comparison as to the two competing facilities on the Savannah River is in order. H.R. 6016 authorizes the construction of this Federal project at an estimated cost of $78,700,000. Other estimates of the project run as high as $100 million. This cost, of course, would come from the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. This hydroelectric facility will have no requirements for fuel after construction, and will, of course, pay absolutely no taxes to either the National, State, or local governments. On the other hand, if the Duke Power dam were to be authorized and constructed, the total capital expenditures upon completion would be $210 million, all from private sources. In addition to this, it would require approximately $24 million worth of coal per year, because it would be a steam generated plant, and basically different from the hydroelectric project. Other operation and maintenance costs, exclusive of fuel, would be $3 million per year for the Duke facility, as compared with only $483,000 for the Federal project. The Duke Power project would pay annual local and State taxes to the extent of $5,950,000, in addition to $7,400,000 annual Federal income tax. This is, of course, in comparison to no taxes which would accrue to any level of Government from the construction of the Federal project.

The diversion dam, which would be built by Duke Power Co., would be approximately 40 feet high and would not

adversely affect further development of the Savannah River Valley. It would flood only about 1,500 acres of land, and this 1,500 acres is now privately owned by Duke Power Co. and would continue to be on the tax rolls.

In contrast to this, the Trotters Shoals Dam would be approximately 180 feet high and would flood approximately 24,000 acres, all of which, of course, would be removed from the tax rolls. Included in these 24,000 acres are 8 prime industrial sites, 4 on the Georgia side and 44 on the South Carolina side, which are badly needed to boost the economy of this entire region, on both sides of the river. Senator Charles E. Daniel, the board chairman of the Daniel Construction Co., has said that:

This area is blessed with a tremendous amount of free-flowing water. One of the largest natural gas lines in America crosses it. Equally large liquid petroleum lines cross it. There are two railroads and truck and air transportation. More important, there are many thousands of people on both sides of the river who desperately need jobs.

My firm has 47 industrial prospects that want to build new plants in the Southeast. Every year it becomes more difficult to find sites such as this for plants which require a great amount of water. I confidently believe that we can have more than $500 million worth of industry along this stretch of river and in the supporting areas within the next 10 to 15 years.

But if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built, it will knock out the possibility of the primary plants along the river and their satellite plants.

Of primary concern is the planned construction by the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp., of a $40 to $50 million plant on the Savannah River in Abbeville County, S.C. The counties most closely concerned with this in Georgia are: Lincoln, Wilkes, Elbert, Hart, Franklin, Stephens, Madison, Oglethorpe, McDuffie, and Columbia. The counties most closely concerned in South Carolina are: Abbeville, McCormick, Greenwood, Edgefield, Saluda, Newberry, Anderson, Oconee, Greenville, and Laurens. In all of these counties, in both South Carolina and Georgia, tree farming is the largest farm crop. As a matter of fact, the annual growth in these counties presently exceeds the annual cut. Sixty percent of the entire area is in forest land. If the Mead Corp. should build this paper plant, they would purchase $9.5 million worth of pulp wood annually, according to the testimony of Mr. Ford T. Sheppard, vice president of Mead Pulp & Paper Corp. They would pay an annual freight bill of $4.5 million. The mill would employ 675 people at an annual payroll of $5 million. The people who would be employed in the woods and on the farms as a result of this mill would be approximately 2,500, and taxes accruing to National, State, and local governments would be approximately $4 million annually. However, the Mead Corp. has stated that it could not erect this plant if the Trotters Shoals government dam is built, because the site it now owns would be flooded by the reservoir which would be created.

Mr. President, the sole argument in favor of the construction of this Government project, other than the production of power, centers around its value as a recreational area. It should be noted, however, that in addition to other recreational facilities, in this immediate vicinity there are already two large reservoirs as a result of existing Federal dams, and these provide more than sufficient recreational sites. What is needed is not more recreational sites, but more jobs and a healthier economy, so that those recreational facilities now existing can be utilized to their full capacity.

Mr. President, after carefully weighing all of these considerations the South Carolina General Assembly adopted a resolution memorializing the Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors of the U.S. Army not to authorize the construction of this project. I would like to read this concurrent resolution:

RESOLUTION —

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prohibit the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir project until ways and means have been provided to assure that the areas of the State affected will not be rendered undesirable for industry

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that the U.S. Army Engineer Division, South Atlantic, of the Corps of Engineers, has recommended the construction of a hydroelectric dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River which will back water from the Clark Hill Reservoir to Hartwell Dam, and with the Clark Hill and Hartwell Reservoirs, completely stop the free flow of water from the headwaters of Hartwell Lake to Augusta, Ga.; and

Whereas the general assembly looks with great concern upon any project which will thusly affect our waters which are so important to the industrial development and economy of the State; and

Whereas the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors plans to review these recommendations and has requested suggestions and recommendations from the interested parties; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in studying the plans for the Trotters Shoals development, has clearly indicated that the effect that this proposed dam will have on the waste assimilative capacity of the Savannah River is not known; and

Whereas, if the proposed project becomes a reality, it will pour upon the State an additional quantity of electric power for which there is no foreseeable need as people of the State now are served adequately by both public and private sources at reasonable rates; and

Whereas Trotters Shoals Dam will on one hand give the State an excess of electric power, it will on the other hand render the area affected undesirable for private industry, thusly depriving the State of much-needed tax revenue and opportunities for gainful employment of a segment of its people; and

Whereas the industrial site which is now owned by a major industry will be rendered unusable if the capacity of the waters of the Savannah River to assimilate municipal and industrial wastes is reduced, and

Whereas the South Carolina water pollution control act sets up certain purity standards, the complying with which will result in great additional expenditures to municipalities and industries alike if they are to treat wastes before discharging them into lakes of the State; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has made no provision to defray this increased cost to municipalities and industries; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the effect upon water pollution control that the impoundment of waters of the Savannah River by the Trotters Shoals project should be first determined, and that funds for the construction and operation of necessary treatment plants be provided before the project is finally approved, and that these additional costs should be considered a part of the overall cost of the entire project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is hereby memorialized not to authorize the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River until definite plans have been made to assure industry that those areas of the State affected by the reservoir will not be rendered undesirable for industry: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and Georgia and to each Representative in the Congress of the United States from South Carolina and Georgia, and to the Chairman of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Mr. President, in line with the wishes of the people of South Carolina, and their elected officials in the State legislature, the former Governor, Ernest F. Hollins, disapproved the construction of this project. After the election of our present Governor, the Honorable Donald S. Russell, the burden of making a decision with regard to this matter was renewed. Governor Russell went to great lengths to have the views of all interested parties so that he could make an informed decision. He held two public hearings in our State capitol, Columbia, S.C., and heard much testimony. In addition, he appointed the president of the University of South Carolina, Dr. Thomas F. Jones, to act as consultant engineer. After carefully reviewing all of the evidence presented, Governor Russell sent the following letter to Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., the Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, officially disapproving this project.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 14, 1963.

W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: I have reviewed the tentative plans for the construction of what is known as the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River near Calhoun Falls, S.C. Such reservoir is part of a larger plan, developed by the Corps of Engineers originally in 1944 and intended to cover the entire Savannah River Basin. Already, as a part of this overall plan, dams have been constructed at Clarks Hill and Hartwell on the Savannah River. The present project would cover the approximately 30 miles of the Savannah River between the Clarks Hill and Hartwell developments.

There is a difference of opinion in this State with respect to the wisdom of the proposed project and its impact on the industrial growth of this State. I understand that this plan was not approved by my predecessor in office; I am requested to alter that decision.

In order to obtain all facts and information available to guide me toward a wise judgment in this regard, I held two public hearings, afforded all interested citizens and groups an opportunity to present their views on this project.

After due consideration, I am of the opinion, as Governor of South Carolina, that I cannot approve the plan for the Trotters Shoals Reservoir as presented to me by the Corps of Engineers.

I shall not review the conflicting arguments submitted to me at the hearing. I shall confine myself to some of the reasons which prompt my decision.

I

Both those supporting and those opposing the project are largely in agreement that they desire to see a proposed steamplant of Duke Power Co. completed on the upper part of the Savannah River involved in the Corps of Engineers project. This steamplant will require a small dam across the Savannah River. It is the position of the proponents of the Trotters Shoals project that this Duke steamplant is compatible with the Trotters Shoals project; and they accordingly support both projects. And the report of the Corps of Engineers, submitted in February 1962, states flatly that the construction of the Duke steamplant is compatible with the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir.

The Duke plant offers many advantages to South Carolina and its subdivisions. It is estimated that this plant will add approximately $7 million per year to the taxable revenue of this State and its subdivisions. On the other hand, it is disputed whether Trotters Shoals, if constructed, would add anything appreciable to the taxable revenues of the State. Moreover, it would produce almost 25 times as much electric power as the proposed Trotters Shoals Reservoir. South Carolina accordingly has an important stake in the successful construction of this Duke plant.

The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers. At the hearings before me Duke pointed out that, if the Corps of Engineers should in its final plans construct the Trotters Shoals project with a certain height or other features, the Duke project, in its judgment, would not be compatible either from an engineering or an economic viewpoint. Since there is no agreement between the Corps of Engineers and Duke on the compatibility of the two projects, the State of South Carolina has no assurance that the Trotters Shoals project will not eventually preclude the Duke construction. South Carolina would not wish to put in jeopardy the Duke project.

II

In another vital area, the report of the Corps of Engineers leaves open a matter which might be of serious consequence to many municipalities and industrial plants now using the Savannah River and its tributaries for waste discharge. Thus, on page 32, this report states: "No specific items of local cooperation are proposed due to the nature of the project and benefits. Several communities and industries in the area use the river and its tributary streams for the disposal of raw and partially treated domestic and industrial wastes. For example, the city of Anderson, S.C., discharges partially treated domestic and industrial waste into a branch of Rocky River and into Big Generostee Creek; the city of Elberton, Ga., discharges raw sewage and industrial waste into Beaverdam Creek; and the Rocky River plant of the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. dumps partially treated industrial waste into Rocky River. While the situation is currently permitted or tolerated, the pollution of streams and related problems is a matter within the responsibility of State and local government agencies and this responsibility would not be altered by construction of the Trotters Shoals project. A detailed survey has not been made specifically for this report of all sources or the magnitude of existing pollution problems in the area."

This same point is emphasized anew in the letter of January 28, 1963, from the Chief, Corps of Engineers, to me in these words: "The U.S. Public Health Service has stated that the effects of existing and foreseeable waste discharges on possible recreational, municipal and industrial water supplies should be studied. This matter will be investigated further during preconstruction planning if the project is authorized. At that time, correction of any adverse effects on waste treatment plants or water intake structures for which there may be a project responsibility, such as plant alterations necessitated by the rise in water surface will be planned in detail. However, Federal responsibility is not considered to extend to participation in the cost of constructing new or expanded waste treatment measures solely because a reservoir is provided, unless this is the more economical way of correcting a condition which otherwise would be a Federal responsibility."

What steps the city of Anderson and other municipalities might subsequently be required to take in connection with their waste disposal and who would bear the expense of the same, if this project is constructed, is a matter of substantial importance to the taxpayers of Anderson and the other municipalities which might be involved. These and other related questions are unanswered.

Further, this proposed development, with its control over the water resources of the area, will affect the industrial growth of an important area of our State. The rules which the Federal Government will apply in connection with waste discharges will be of considerable interest to any industrial prospect. It was suggested at the hearing that one industry already located in the area would, if this reservoir is constructed, have to spend three-quarters of a million dollars on waste controls. Certainly, any new industry would want to know what would control the use of the water impounded in the reservoir. The plan submitted leaves all this to future review.

III

Many opponents of the proposed project base their objection on the ground that the project, if constructed, would eliminate the possibility of a large paper and pulp plant, now under consideration for this area by the Mead Corp. It seems agreed that this plant could not be built on a site now owned by the Mead Corp. in Abbeville County, if the Trotters Shoals Reservoir is built.

The Mead Corp., through its chief executive, appeared at the hearings to oppose the Trotters Shoals Reservoir. It stated that it expected to build a new plant in the next few years, and this Abbeville area seemed an excellent location. It pointed to its purchase of a substantial amount of timberlands in this area as evidence of its serious intentions. It was, however, unwilling to commit itself definitely and indicated that its decisions would be determined by future demands for pulp products.

The value of a pulp plant in the Abbeville area is recognized. It would provide a market for the pulp produced in volume in this section of our State. Moreover, it would contribute substantially to tax revenues and employment in this State.

IV

It should be noted that the Trotters Shoals development is part of a general plan developed in 1944. Many changes have taken place since that time. It is entirely conceivable that a fresh review of the overall development plan for the Savannah River might alter this plan. Recent years have given greater urgency to wise and judicious use of water both for domestic and industrial purposes. The letter to me from Dr. Jones, hereto attached, emphasizes this point and suggests that the State of South Carolina might well conduct such a review.

The economic justification of the project was seriously questioned in the hearings. To discuss such question would unduly prolong this letter. I have already stated my conclusions on the plan as presented.

Very truly yours,

DONALD RUSSELL.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question which is presented to us today can be stated very simply. Should this area be developed by our free enterprise system or by the Federal Government? In this case, private enterprise is both willing and able to develop the area. The power which would be generated by the Duke Power dam is 25 times greater than that which would be generated by the Trotters Shoals hydroelectric facility.

In line with the statement of the President of the United States before the Committee for Economic Development, I feel that private enterprise should be given the opportunity to develop this area and provide what is needed: More jobs for our people, increased payrolls, more tax receipts, better prices for our pulpwood, and cheaper electric power for our people.

Mr. President, numerous chambers of commerce in this area have voiced their opposition to the construction of this project. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, resolutions from the Greenwood, S.C., Chamber of Commerce; from the McCormick, S.C., Chamber of Commerce; and from the Anderson, S.C., Chamber of Commerce. Also I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, resolutions of the Georges Creek Grange, No. 479; the Hollywood Grange, No. 642; and a copy of an original resolution adopted by the Abbeville County Farm Bureau, and subsequently adopted by numerous other organizations, supporting the planned construction of the Mead Corp. facility at their site on the Savannah River. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the organizations which subsequently adopted this original resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the following items showing opposition to the construction of the Trotters Shoals project:

An editorial from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., of October 11, 1962, entitled "Should Break Political Impasse."

An editorial from the Calhoun Falls News of Calhoun Falls, S.C., of February 22, 1962, entitled "Can Calhoun Falls Afford a Dam?"

An editorial from the Greenville Piedmont, of Greenville, S.C., of February 24, 1962, entitled "Trotters Shoals Dam."

An editorial entitled "Hearings Slated on Trotters Shoals Dam," from the

March 14, 1963, edition of the Clinton, S.C., Chronicle.

An editorial from the Laurens, S.C., Advertiser of March 20, 1963, entitled, "Trotters Shoals Affect County."

An editorial entitled "Idiotic and Outrageous" from the Georgetown, S.C., Times of Thursday, March 28, 1963.

An editorial from the Columbia, S.C., State of April 25, 1963, entitled "A Fight for Right."

An editorial from the Greenwood, S.C., Index Journal of April 29, 1963, entitled "A Rare Opportunity."

Another editorial from the State of Columbia, S.C., of April 30, 1963, entitled "Free Enterprise at Stake."

An editorial from the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald-Journal of May 5, 1963, entitled "Governor Has Key Roll in a Vital Decision."

An editorial from the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., of May 13, 1963, entitled "Stop Trotters Shoals."

Another editorial from the Charleston News & Courier of May 16, 1963, entitled "A Wise Decision."

An editorial from the Greenville, S.C., Piedmont, of May 18, 1963, entitled "Trotters Shoals Dam."

An editorial from the Orangeburg, S.C., Times and Democrat of May 28, 1963, entitled "Trotters Shoals Power Project Vital Issue for South Carolina."

An editorial from the Augusta Chronicle-Augusta Herald of Augusta, Ga., of April 28, 1963, entitled "We Oppose Trotters Shoals."

An editorial from the May 6, 1963, edition of the Macon News, Macon, Ga., entitled "Does Georgia Want Industry?"

An editorial from the May 9, 1963, edition of the McDuffie Progress, Thomson, Ga., entitled, "Private Enterprise versus Government."

An editorial from the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle of May 16, 1963, entitled "Decision Founded on Facts."

Another editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of May 22, 1963, entitled "Opportunity For Industry."

Another editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of June 6, 1963, entitled "Duke Has Strong Argument."

Excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Advocate-Democrat of Crawfordville, Ga., entitled "Free Enterprise and Trotters Shoals."

Excerpts from an editorial which appeared in The News-Reporter of Washington, Ga., entitled "Mead Versus Trotters Shoals."

The May 13, 1963, edition of my newsletter entitled, "Big Dam Foolishness."

Mr. President, after reviewing the amendments made by the Senate Public Works Committee to H.R. 6016, especially the addition of the Trotters Shoals project, I shall be unable to support the bill and would like for the RECORD to show my opposition to this legislation.

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

RESOLUTION OF GREENWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce is aware of the fact that the Mead Paper Corp. owns a site on the Savannah River upon which the company plans in the future to build a pulp and paper mill; and

Whereas such a mill would create a ready market for forest products from Greenwood County farms as well as from other counties in South Carolina and Georgia; and

Whereas the proposed mill would create an annual payroll of $5 million with another $9.5 million spent annually for pulpwood purchases; and

Whereas this would mean an increase in employment in the area of 675 persons at the mill and about 650 workers in the woods; and

Whereas the market for local forest products has been declining in recent years while the total acreage in forest land is being steadily increased: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce, That the Mead Paper Corp. be invited, in fact urged, to construct a pulp and paper mill at its site on the Savannah River at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to Mr. Howard W. Whitaker, chairman of the board, Mead Corp.; Gov. Donald S. Russell; Senator Olin D. Johnston; Senator J. Strom Thurmond; Congressman W. J. Bryan Dorn; and the South Carolina State Development Board.

Approved and adopted this fifth day of March 1963.

FRANK H. EDWARDS,
President.
ALVIN W. PARKER,
Manager.

RESOLUTION OF THE MCCORMICK, S.C., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Honorable Donald Russell, the Governor of South Carolina, has called a hearing in Columbia, S.C., on March 18 to gather the public viewpoint of the proposed construction of a $78 million proposed dam at Trotters Shoals on Savannah River; and

Whereas on November 2, 1959, this chamber adopted a set of resolutions opposing any further Federal reservoirs on the Savannah River in this area from the headwaters of Clark Hill Lake to the Hartwell Dam; and

Whereas this chamber's purpose for adopting these resolutions opposing further Federal reservoir projects in the area mentioned are based upon the convictions that this organization from our own experience that Federal reservoir projects do not promote the industrial development of this area but conversely does hinder such industrial development; and

Whereas this chamber is further informed that Mead Paper Corp. proposes to build a pulpwood mill near Calhoun Falls on the Savannah River and that the proposed Federal Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir would make this proposed pulpwood plant impossible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the McCormick Chamber of Commerce favors the proposed pulpwood plant to be built by Mead Paper Corp. which this chamber feels is vitally needed to boost our local lumber industry both as to production and market price of pulpwood timber and related forest products; that this second-ranking industry in our area is now in a depressed state and a pulpwood plant is vitally important to this area; that construction of a pulpwood plant at the proposed Mead site would place McCormick County in the primary producing area of the plant and would further improve market and price conditions in this industry; and be it further

Resolved, That this chamber is opposed to the construction of the Federal Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir as being incompatible with the proposed Mead paper plant and with further industrial development of this section of the Savannah River; and be it further

Resolved, That the President name a representative or representatives to present this resolution to the Governor's hearing on March 18 in Columbia and to further submit the chamber's position on this matter as outlined in its resolutions of November 2, 1959.

This resolution unanimously passed at a special called meeting the 21st day of February 1963.

W. N. SMITH,
President.

Attest:

FRANK B. HARRISON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF ANDERSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas on November 11, 1959, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution in opposition to construction by the Corps of Engineers of the then proposed Carter's Island and Goat Island Dams on the Savannah River between Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam. This resolution also embodied opposition to any other Government dams on this stretch of the Savannah River; and

Whereas on March 13, 1962, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution in opposition to the construction by the Corps of Engineers of Trotters Shoals Dam on the same stretch of water on the Savannah River. This resolution, likewise, embodied opposition to the construction by the Government of any dams on this area of the Savannah River; and

Whereas on August 17, 1962, the board of directors of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce, proceeding under the belief that a compromise on these positions would help Anderson County secure approval of Congress for Duke Power Co. to construct a 2-million-kilowatt steam powerplant on the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County, and assuming that Trotters Shoals Dam and the Duke plant would be compatible, passed a resolution asking for the construction of both the Duke powerplant and Trotters Shoals Dam, and

Whereas it now appearing that the latter resolution did not have the desired result and it also appearing at the present time that the Trotters Shoals Dam would probably not be compatible with the Duke plant because definite information is not available at this time as to the final plans of the Corps of Engineers, and it further appearing that the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam would utilize virtually all that section of the Savannah River from Clark Hill Reservoir to Hartwell Dam, particularly if pumpback storage is included in the Engineers plans; and

Whereas the board of directors of the chamber of commerce still believes that the utilization of this section of the Savannah River by private taxpaying business and industry would best serve the interests of this county, South Carolina, and Georgia through employment of hundreds of people on construction jobs and permanent jobs in plants which would be established there if Trotters Shoals or other Government dams are not built. The board can see no benefits from Trotters Shoals Dam which would come to this area of South Carolina and Georgia. We can foresee tremendous benefits from the Duke plant and other potential industrial plants to be located along both sides of this free-flowing section of Savannah River: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Anderson Chamber of Commerce board of directors in regular meeting assembled does hereby revert to its original position in opposition to Trotters Shoals, Carter's Island, Goat Island, or any Government dams on the Savannah River in this area, and hereby urge all constituted authorities, particularly the Governor of South Carolina who has a hearing arranged on the Trotters Shoals Dam March 18 at Columbia, to oppose any effort on the part of the Corps of Engineers to located addi-

tional Government dams on this section of the Savannah River.

Approved at Anderson, S.C., this 12th day of March 1963.

JOHN A. HOLMAN, *President.*
Z. W. MEEKS, *Manager.*

RESOLUTION OF GEORGES CREEK GRANGE No. 479

Whereas the Georges Creek Grange No. 479 is perpetually interested in matters concerning the farmer, knowing that whatever benefits the farmer, will in turn benefit all people; and

Whereas tree farming is one of our greatest means of earning a livelihood, and is now bringing in more farm income than any other single crop in South Carolina; and

Whereas our Georges Creek Grange watershed project, when complete, will contain thousands of acres of land planted with millions of pine seedlings; and

Whereas the thousands of acres of young pines now growing will be ready for harvest in a very few years, and the location of a pulp and paper mill close by will provide a ready market for this product: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georges Creek Grange go on record as requesting our members of Congress, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, senior Senator from South Carolina; the Honorable J. STROM THURMOND, junior Senator from South Carolina; and the Honorable W. J. BRYAN DORN, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of South Carolina, to use their influence and efforts to persuade the Mead Co. to locate a paper and pulp mill on their Savannah River site in South Carolina.

Respectfully submitted.

CLAUDE LESLIE,
RAYMOND HUGHEY,
SAM H. ROBINSON,
Committee.

Unanimously adopted during our annual spring rally and covered dish supper, March 11, 1963.

MRS. CHARLES CARSON,
Secretary.
JOHN R. MCCRAVY,
Master.

RESOLUTION BY HOLLYWOOD GRANGE NO. 642, SALUDA, S.C.

Whereas Saluda County is situated on the slate belt that passes through South Carolina and Georgia, and the slate belt is known to be the fastest timber growing soil in the Southeast; and

Whereas timber is a natural resource and tree farming is our largest industry; and statistics show in 1959 that 53.9 percent of the total land in Saluda County was in forest land and more acreage being planted to pines each year; and

Whereas 62 percent of Abbeville County is in forest land; approximately the same for Elbert, Hart, Lincoln, and Wilkes Counties in Georgia, and McCormick, Greenwood, and lower Anderson Counties and others in South Carolina; and

Whereas the grange realizes the urgent need in our area for a more convenient market for our pulpwood; and that three farming brings in more farm income than any other single crop in South Carolina; and

Whereas with a pulpmill on Savannah River, truckloads of wood could be hauled direct to the plant; and this would call for far less handling and more profit to the tree farmers in the above mentioned counties in South Carolina and Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Hollywood Grange No. 642, Saluda County, go on record as favoring a Mead pulp and paper mill on their Savannah River site; and be it further

Resolved, That we feel that the individual timber farmers in the above mentioned counties would also favor this project since it would mean much profit to them; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to Mr. Howard W. Whitaker, chairman of the board, Mead Corp., 118 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio; and copies to Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina; Senators Johnston and Thurmond; Walter Harper, director of the South Carolina State Development Board; and William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Member of Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

FRED W. LONG,
Master.

RESOLUTION OF ABBEYVILLE COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Whereas the maintenance of a secure and stable market for pulpwood is of vital importance to the economy of our area, especially to the farmers, landowners, and merchants; and

Whereas we are faced with declining prices and loss of markets for pulpwood in our area; and

Whereas there is a pressing need for the development of a strong market for hardwood pulpwood in our area, which does not now exist; and

Whereas the establishment of a pulp mill in our area will solve these problems in addition to creating many new jobs and stabilizing the jobs of many other workers; and

Whereas we find that the Mead Corp. represents the very highest qualities of management policies, personnel, and community cooperation and responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved: 1. That we do urge the Mead Corp. to build, maintain, and operate a pulp mill at their site on the Savannah River;

2. That we as members and citizens of this community area do commit ourselves to every effort to make this proposed venture by the Mead Corp. successful; and

3. That we do urge all our officials, public and private, to give their complete support to the securing of all necessary rights, permits, and agreements to make possible the construction and successful operation of this facility.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE RESOLUTION OF THE ABBEVILLE COUNTY FARM BUREAU

During the month of February 1963, the Abbeville County Farm Bureau adopted a resolution in support of plans of the Mead Corp. to build a pulp and paper mill at their site on the Savannah River. This resolution was published in several area newspapers.

The following listed organizations subsequently considered and adopted this resolution and requested that all appropriate parties and officials be informed of their overwhelming support for the position of the Abbeville County Farm Bureau:

Abbeville County Pomona Grange No. 8, Abbeville, S.C.

Donalds Grange No. 497, Donalds, S.C.

Greenwood County Farm Bureau, Greenwood, S.C.

Greenwood County Agricultural Committee, Greenwood, S.C.

Greenwood County Pomona Grange No. 21, Greenwood, S.C.

Phoenix Grange No. 593, Greenwood, S.C.

D. Wyatt Aiken Grange No. 598, Coronaca, S.C.

Greenwood Beef Producers Association, Greenwood, S.C.

McCormick County Farm Bureau, McCormick, S.C.

Buffalo Grange No. 630, McCormick, S.C.

Board of Directors, Carolina-Georgia Lumbermen's Association, Washington, Ga.

Lincoln County Farm Bureau, Lincolnton, Ga.

City of Lincolnton, Lincolnton, Ga.

Broad River Forestry Association, Washington, Ga.

Wilkes County Chamber of Commerce, Washington, Ga.

Board of Commissioners, Washington, Ga.

City of Washington, Mayor and Council, Washington, Ga.

Washington-Wilkes Jaycees, Washington, Ga.

Kiwanis Club, Washington, Ga.

Washington Lion's Club, Washington, Ga.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Oct. 11, 1962]

SHOULD BREAK POLITICAL IMPASSE

If, as appears quite likely, Congress fails to authorize construction of a small retaining dam on the Savannah River for the Duke Power Co.'s huge steam electric generating plant, thousands of citizens of both Georgia and South Carolina, and much of the rest of the Southeast, stand to suffer untold loss and harm.

The fact that the simple enabling resolution may be lost because it became involved in a political tangle with the recently proposed public power dam at nearby Trotters Shoals makes the matter even worse. It smells of politics unworthy of the Representatives and Senators of the two States.

The trouble arose in the Senate and the only hope of resolving the difficulty may lie in the ability of Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND of South Carolina and RUSSELL and TALMADGE of Georgia to play the role of statesmen and place the welfare of the region as a whole ahead of the special interests of a relatively few.

Here is how the situation stands now and how it developed:

The annual rivers and harbors bill came over to the Senate from the House of Representatives a few days ago with the authorization for the Duke Dam approved without opposition. Indeed, members of the Georgia House delegation worked with the South Carolinians in putting it through.

In the Senate, however, a series of amendments were adopted to write into the bill, or its own version of the House bill, authorizations for several public power (hydroelectric) projects in various parts of the country at an ultimate cost of hundreds of millions.

Among these was an amendment concurred in by Senators RUSSELL and TALMADGE of Georgia and JOHNSTON of South Carolina calling for construction of the Trotters Shoals dam at what the Army Engineers euphemistically call an initial cost of more than $78 million.

Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, made a futile attempt to have the two proposals—the Duke authorization and the Trotters Shoals item—considered separately and on their respective merits. The Senate adopted the bill, amendments and all, on a voice vote.

The bill or bills were then sent to a joint conference committee of Representatives of the two Houses to adjust and compromise differences. The House refuses to accept the Senate amendments and the Senate (or a few Senators anyway) just as firmly insists that the upper chamber has just as much right as the House to initiate appropriations.

In some quarters, the impasse is being described as a contest between the interests of South Carolina and those of Georgia and certain South Carolinians are being accused of selfish behavior, or worse, and of blocking both items.

There is no real conflict as we can demonstrate. Construction of the Duke plant will benefit both States almost equally and the lake required to provide water for cooling for reusing the steam used to turn the turbines will hurt neither State to any appreciable extent, if at all.

In fact, compared to the high dams such as Clark Hill and Hartwell, it will look more

like a farm pond and the flooding effects will be negligible.

But a comparison of the power it will produce with the output of the proposed installation at Trotters Shoals is in order and is highly revealing.

Its proponents claim that it will generate over 400 million kilowatt-hours of electricity each year.

According to engineering studies completed on this phase of the project, the powerplant would have a rated capacity of 310,000 kilowatts. Under optimum average water level conditions, it would produce about 340 million kilowatt-hours of energy per year.

The Duke steamplant would have a rated installed capacity of 2 million kilowatts and would produce a steady and reliable 10 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy every year.

Let's repeat those figures:

Trotters Shoals—310-million-kilowatt capacity; 340 million kilowatt-hours annual production.

Duke steamplant—2-million-kilowatt capacity; 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

The Duke plant's production would go primarily to South Carolina, and much industrial development depends on its availability. But it also would be tied in with the distribution system of the Georgia Power Co. under existing reciprocal agreements and would directly provide power for Georgia consumers.

On the other hand, Trotters Shoals would flood hundreds of thousands of acres of farm and timber land. It is now a known fact that the Mead Paper Co. plans a $35 million plant in the vicinity, but flooding of the site land and the timberland would make it impossible. Much railroad trackage and property would be inundated.

Yet that paper plant would provide a market for pulpwood now being grown on the land involved in both South Carolina and Georgia. And the profits the growers would receive would be far greater than they can now realize because they have to ship to a distant market.

The Trotters Shoals proposal has yet to be completely studied and judged on its merits. The Army Engineers report was not published until March of this year and further studies are indicated. It has not even been approved by President Kennedy's Budget Bureau.

That is why we say the two matters should be separated and considered on their respective merits. The Duke project, which will cost the taxpayers nothing and will pay millions in Federal, State and local taxes, is ready to go.

The other is not. There is plenty of time to study it, for there is no money yet available to start it.

There is too much at stake for the citizens of both South Carolina and Georgia to allow the present political stalemate to continue.

[From the Calhoun Falls (S.C.) News, Feb. 22, 1962]

CAN CALHOUN FALLS AFFORD A DAM?

The recent efforts of the Army Corps of Engineers to establish a dam at Trotters Shoals indicates these men are making an all-out determined effort to build this dam, which in turn can cost the people of Calhoun Falls, Abbeville County, the State of South Carolina as well as our neighboring State of Georgia, enormously.

We feel, perhaps, the people of our area do not realize the real danger and threat that lies in such a construction.

First, there is no reason for the dam, except to take the taxpayers' money from throughout the Nation and put it into a concrete wall that will destroy some of the best industrial sites in the United States. We do not need the dam for power. We have an abundance of power in our area plus the fact that Duke Power Co. has plans now for a $280 million powerplant just outside of Abbeville County in Anderson County. This alone would be ample power supply with the present sources from which we now receive our power.

If power is not the reason, maybe flood control could be considered. But the area certainly has not had a flood in over 50 years, and with Hartwell above us and Clark Hill below, the chances are even more slim that further flood protection is needed.

Power supply and flood control do not justify the great sum of money to be spent for such a dam. Actually the Army Corps of Engineers will tell you this. The real reason they want to see the dam is that it will be something that would be marveled at the world over. This may be true, to a certain extent, but we cannot see that such a small dam as this would be a great engineering achievement compared to the great Hoover Dam or the many dams in the Tennessee Valley.

We believe these engineers want to take land that can make our town, county, State, and neighboring State grow into a prosperous industrial center, and turn it into a big lake that can only be used for recreation. True, this would be a great wonder for all to see in the making, but the ultimate cost does not justify it. Our American engineers are great; they have proven themselves all over the world. They have even proven themselves here with the Clark Hill and Hartwell Dam.

As a place for recreation, it would possibly provide new fishing grounds for several years, but they would soon grow old, and the anglers would be back on the other lakes and rivers. As for attracting fishermen and skiers from other areas, it would serve little purpose with the other lakes in the area that are closer to these people.

Would the actual construction work of the dam provide many new jobs in the area? Actually these construction companies bring in their own skilled help and when the week end arrives they go back home to their families. As for the purchasing of local materials, we doubt that it would be enough to count. Those who would get jobs for the relatively short period of time would probably make more money on jobs in local industry with permanent sitations. When the dam is completed the jobs would end with these construction companies.

What advantage does the dam have for the people of Calhoun Falls and area? None. What damage can this do to us? Plenty. It will kill all prospects of any new industry of certain types for this area. It will put extra miles on those traveling from Elbert County into Abbeville County to their jobs each day and vise versa. It could cause Calhoun Falls to lose its highway through town and could possibly cause the loss of the Seaboard Railroad. The reason is because the dam would be located several miles below the Calhoun Falls Memorial bridge (which would be under water) and the only crossing would be on the dam or below.

It will cost the taxpayers of the United States some $80 million for no purpose at all. It will cost the counties into which the water would back up the loss of taxes paid on the land. It could put Rocky River Mills on a peninsula which would probably create a complex situation for them.

Can Calhoun Falls afford a dam? To those now in Calhoun Falls it may not be the worst thing that could happen, but for the future generations it would greatly limit opportunities.

What can be done about it? A big question with many unsolved problems. One step is to first understand what the dam does mean. The Abbeville County Development Board will be glad to meet with any group of interested citizens and discuss the problem. Then, it will take a unified effort from us to take it to our Congressional leaders in Washington. This is where it can be stopped. Let's get to work and beat it before it licks us.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Feb. 24, 1962]

TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

There appears to be a difference of opinion between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and members of the Abbeville County Development Board over a recent recommendation by the engineers to construct a $78.7-million multipurpose dam and reservoir on the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals.

Could this be Federal incursion on State property?

The Abbeville County board seems to think so—and with good reason.

John T. McGee, president of the board, has expressed shock over the proposal to construct a 480-foot dam on the river, especially after the Corps of Engineers had stated publicly about a year ago that dams in the area proposed "are not an essential part of the development of the Savannah."

Mr. McGee seems particularly perturbed over the fact that such a dam as the new one proposed would inundate some choice industrial sites and cause other harm to the area.

However, news that the Corps of Engineers had proposed to erect a new dam on the Savannah with millions of dollars in taxpayers' money was greeted in other quarters—not the Abbeville County Development Board—with a great deal of enthusiasm.

There appears to be some sort of contagion which smacks of prosperity (with a capital P) whenever Federal projects of this nature are announced. People seem to get the fever and feel they are getting something for nothing.

Perhaps there is a real need for a big dam at Trotters Shoals.

Possibly it is an eminently satisfactory thing.

The answer remains to be revealed.

[From the Clinton (S.C.) Chronicle, Mar. 19, 1963]

HEARING SLATED ON TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

Governor Russell has called a public hearing in Columbia on March 18 (next Monday) on the proposed Trotters Shoals Government dam on the Savannah River.

This dam would cost the taxpayers approximately $100 million (the estimated figure, which would more than likely be raised by 50 or 100 percent if it follows the usual course of Federal projects).

Further, it would flood almost all of the Mead Co.'s pulpmill and papermill site on the Savannah River in Abbeville County. This projected mill would be built on about the only remaining site on which such a mill could be built in this area. The mill would furnish a market close at hand for thousands of our farmers who have converted their former cotton lands to the growing of pulpwood.

Then, too, if the Trotters Shoals Dam were built it would push out of the picture a tremendous Duke Power Co. generating plant, which is proposed to be built on the Savannah River at a cost, we understand, of about $300 million. This would be a taxpaying project—and would cost the taxpayers not a dime.

Georgians, across the river, are opposing the Duke plant in South Carolina while South Carolinians do not think the Trotters Shoals Dam should be built.

Laurens County citizens should join with others from the State in attending the hearing in Columbia on Monday and express themselves vigorously in opposition to the Government project at Trotters Shoals.

[From the Laurens (S.C.) Advertiser, Mar. 20, 1963]

TROTTERS SHOALS AFFECTS COUNTY

This country was founded on the principle of the least government, the best government. That is not so today. We have sat by and let the Federal Government, which continues to gnaw away at our every basic freedom, move into our church, our school, and our business.

Another illustration is the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam between Clarks Hill and Hartwell Dam. We, along with many other opponents, believe that the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam would destroy fine industrial sites and become just another fishpond or skiing resort.

Mead Paper Co. has made public their intentions of building a papermill in that area provided the dam is not built. This papermill would affect Laurens County directly in that our pulpwood growers would have a tremendous market.

Laurens County now ranks 15th in pulpwood production with a total of 245,000 acres planted in woodland. As there are only 448,640 acres in Laurens County, it is not difficult to see the importance of our pulpwood industry.

[From the Georgetown (S.C.) Times, Mar. 28, 1963]

IDIOTIC AND OUTRAGEOUS

For a simple proposition, try this:

What is better? A $200 million investment by private, tax paying industry to develop the world's largest steam generating plant and a large papermill or a $78 million project for a Government dam and huge reservoir that will produce no tax revenue and flood vast acres of private property?

It seems almost inconceivable that such a question would ever arise, but it has. To our way of thinking it raises very serious doubts about the direction of the Federal Government and the economic values that motivate many men in it.

In upper South Carolina, a potentially huge industrial complex stands on the horizon for Abbeville, Anderson, Edgefield and McCormick Counties with economic advantages spilling over into many counties in Georgia.

Duke Power Co. wants to build the world's largest steam generating plant in Anderson County to produce electricity. Mead Paper Co. wants to construct a papermill that will employ about 650 persons on a 1,000-acre site in Abbeville County. Both developments would mean large sums of tax revenue for the counties involved, the State of South Carolina and the U.S. Government.

But what has happened? Both projects are being blocked by the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam that is being proposed by the Federal Government. Instead of producing tax revenue, this project would be financed by tax revenue.

What pray tell has happened on the New Frontier?

Instead of getting the country moving again, it seems that a group of politicians and their bureaucratic bedfellows are hell-bent on shoving it backwards.

Great ballyhoo is made of economically depressed areas, but few counties in the United States are any more depressed than McCormick County, S.C. The Federal Government owns well over half of the total area of the county, which is dismally poor. Yet projects of taxpaying industries that could immeasurably benefit the county are being stymied by political intrigue in the Federal Government itself and by political interests in Georgia.

Great concern is being expressed by the Kennedy planners about the plight of railroads. Yet here are two projects, a steam generating plant and a papermill, that would be of vast benefit to railroads and not cost the Federal Government a cent.

Great distress is portrayed as agricultural employment declines and unemployment increases. Yet here is private industry wanting to create jobs and provide more desperately needed employment, only to be stymied in the foul bed of politics.

Economic development in the United States is being denied in the Savannah River Valley to taxpaying enterprises for the sake of a tax-free Federal dam that at best would provide only a handful of jobs and create no tax revenue for local governments or the Federal Government itself.

If this is good government, good economics, good sense, we simply do not see it.

The whole business smells to the high heavens with politics at its foul worst. It is idiotic and outrageous.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 25, 1963]

A FIGHT FOR THE RIGHT

Jobs and income necessarily come before men's recreation; otherwise, there would not even be the means of getting to the places of recreation.

One of the prime issues over the proposed publicly financed Trotters Shoals Dam has now been boiled down to jobs versus recreation. Those favoring the development have admitted that highly suitable sites for industry would be inundated by the waters of the project, but point to the recreational advantages the lakes would provide.

It is not a good argument that potential employment would indeed be drowned out but that a large new facility for recreation would be created. It is a very unsound argument. It places the cart before the horse.

It was Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN who drew from an officer of the Corps of Army Engineers the admission that this development would wipe out excellent industrial locations, and it was this officer whose rebuttal cited the recreational benefits which would come. The officer cited the success of the Clark Hill development, on the Savannah River, below Trotters Shoals, as a center for the recreational pleasure of citizens, his point being that Trotters Shoals would serve a similar purpose.

This argument becomes doubly fallacious when one remembers how close Clark Hill is to the area where Trotters Shoals' lakes would appear. Why not let industry grow in the Trotters area and let the holders of the new jobs and their families use the Clark's Hill center for their recreation?

We believe in adequate facilities for recreation. We aren't blind to the fact that properly practiced outdoor enjoyments do indeed recreate. But neither are we blind to the hard necessities of sustenance through income-earning employment.

The privately owned utility (Duke Power Co.) which would build a very large electric generating plant in the Trotters Shoals area would not risk so much private capital if it did not have reasonable assurance of industrial development there. Duke has been restrained by those who want the public project. Those who adhere to the idea that government should do what private enterprise cannot do are silenced in this instance. Private enterprise stands ready to provide.

The publicly financed project should be abandoned. Duke should be permitted to proceed with its job-giving, taxpaying enterprise. Jobholders with the incomes which the employment would provide would get their recreation.

Mr. DORN and those with him are making a fight for commonsense. They fight for the right as represented by firm realities which should not be questioned.

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index Journal, April 29, 1963]

A RARE OPPORTUNITY

A controversy over the proposal to construct a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River has developed considerable bitterness. That is greatly to be regretted, but the issue is so clear-cut that there is little room for compromise, and perhaps some bitterness is to be expected.

The position of the Index-Journal has been that much greater economic benefits would accrue to the entire area from the construction of the Mead Corp. paper mill and the Duke Power Co. steam plant than ever would result from the dam.

One of the points at issue is whether Mead really intends to build a paper mill on its site near Calhoun Falls. That is a valid point, but it seems that the statement of Fort T. Shepherd, Mead vice president, before the subcommittee hearing in Washington last week is about as close as a company can give to positive assurance that the plant will be built.

"We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment." Mr. Shepherd said, "However, this important decision cannot be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for the adequate treatment and processing of our effluent."

No corporation could pledge unconditionally the expenditure of millions of dollars in new plant construction for some time in the future. The conditions are the same as when the Chemstrand Co. said when it began construction here that it expected additional construction in the future if economic conditions and its own market conditions warranted it.

That is about all that can be said.

Mead also cannot build without some assurance that its water supply will remain accessible. In a kind of chicken-and-egg situation, Mead says it cannot build until this assurance is given. Proponents of Trotters Shoals say they want the dam because there is no assurance the plant will be built.

On this page today is a large part of the address given before a joint session of the South Carolina General Assembly by H. T. Whitaker, chairman of the board of Mead Corp. In it he gives some information on what construction of the Mead plant would mean to this section. He also gives some idea of the tremendous proportions of the paper industry in the South.

A pulpwood truck, battered as a rule from the hard treatment it receives, would hardly be chosen by the uninformed as the symbol of the South that the region is attempting to build. Yet Mr. Whitaker says that each such pulpwood truck represents about $25,000 in annual income to the community in which it operates.

At Chillicothe, Ohio, where one of the large Mead plants is situated, pulpwood trucks almost fill the highways. They bring a load of pulpwood to the mill and the owner or operator returns home with a check in his pocket.

It is our feeling that Mead has demonstrated as convincingly as it can that it wants to use the site for the purpose for which it was bought. We would like to see them given that opportunity. We can think of few industries which would spread its economic benefits over such a wide area of this section as would a paper mill. The opportunity to have one seems too valuable to be wasted.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 30, 1963]

FREE ENTERPRISE AT STAKE

The man who may hold the decisive hand in the dispute over whether a public power development or one of private ownership should be built on the upper Savannah River is Gov. Donald S. Russell. And now is the time for the Governor to make his decision. It would be a mistake for him to delay it. He is the man in the middle.

Reduced to its basic terms, the controversy lies between those who want the Federal Government to build at Trotters Shoals another in its growing series of dams along the Savannah River and those who wish to preserve the last remaining stretch of the upper Savannah for development by private industry.

Some effort has been made to label the dispute a fight between South Carolina and Georgia, since the greater measure of support for the Federal project comes from Georgia, and the greater opposition from South Carolina. But no real case for such a classification can be made out, since there are overlaps of both support and opposition.

The issue is not South Carolina versus Georgia; it is socialism versus free enterprise. The very alignment of forces on each side proves the point. The chief promoters of the Federal project are those linked directly or indirectly with the Rural Electrification Administration and who constantly seek to expand the public power empire.

Opposing them are businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations, industrialists, and others who see a greater future for the region, the State, and the Nation if free enterprise is allowed to develop its potential for providing jobs, payrolls, and taxes.

In this particular fight, South Carolina already has lost heavily because of the "dog in the manger" attitude of some Georgia Congressmen and the public power bureaucrats. Duke Power Co., which was ready to proceed with the construction of the largest steam-generating plant in the world at Middleton Shoals, was thwarted in its effort, causing a loss in tax revenues alone to local, State, and Federal Governments of more than $13 million a year.

If public power partisans succeed in building their Federal dam at Trotters Shoals, they will effectively destroy all hopes for a multi-million-dollar paper mill pledged to the area by the Mead Corp. That mill, by its wood consumption, its employment, and its taxpaying, would have a tremendous impact on the region's economy.

The issues are clear. The facts are at hand. The Flood Control Subcommittee of the U.S. House Committee on Public Works is ready to vote on the matter. The man yet to be heard from is the Chief Executive of South Carolina, and his attitude will carry great weight, perhaps to the point of being the controlling factor, in the congressional vote.

Donald Russell has been both an articulate champion and a successful product of the American system of free enterprise and competitive private industry.

South Carolinians await his decision with more than passing interest. He must declare himself, and soon.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald-Journal, May 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR HAS KEY ROLE IN A VITAL DECISION

A decision of exceeding importance to South Carolina is about to be made.

The struggle, embroils Georgia, South Carolina, Columbia and Washington.

Subject: Trotters Shoals Dam.

Line of battle: Private industrial development for the creation of jobs and payrolls versus Government production of electricity.

The site is in Abbeville County, on the Savannah River.

A key role in the dispute belongs to Gov. Donald Russell, whose position on the matter is being awaited anxiously in Washington as well as in South Carolina.

The Governor has had a hearing on the question. He wants to see an engineering study being made by the University of South Carolina. His position will have a significant bearing on the issue.

U.S. Representative BRYAN DORN, of Greenwood, has put his political figure on the line in standing for industrial development and against Government monopoly of the Savannah.

In doing so, he opposes an extremely powerful political combine in his own district—that of Anderson Publisher Wilton Hall and Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. Both are advocates of Federal power production in preference to private development.

Word is that the Senator's brother, Bill, is likely to oppose DORN in the next congressional election. And DORN has been placed on the liberal and labor union list for political purging.

But in the Trotters Shoals case, the Congressman has the power of fact with him.

A Federal dam at Trotters Shoals would flood thousands of acres of land, including vast and valuable industrial sites. This is not disputed. The only retort is that other sites would be created, but the argument is extremely weak.

Mead Paper Corp., for instance, owns a site now. It plans to construct a plant which would create employment for more than 1,300 people in that section of the State.

Its annual payroll would be about $5 million. It would pay local taxes (not counting income taxes) of $400,000 a year. The economic impact of such as industry would be tremendous.

Mead's site would be flooded by a Federal lake. It could not build its plant.

Yet, a Government dam would cost the taxpayers more than $78 million. The facility, being Government, would pay no taxes. Its employment would be nil. In fact, it would go into competition with private firms which do employ people and pay taxes.

Why, then, this push for a Federal dam?

It's a drive for Federal monopoly of river resources. Today, only a 29-mile section remains free, from Clark Hill on the south to Hartwell Dam on the north. Trotters Shoals would complete the chain all the way to the nuclear plant at Aiken.

Usually the claim for Federal programs is that they are justified where private enterprise cannot or will not fulfill the needs of the people.

Aside from Mead's plans, Duke Power Co. has been stymied in its proposal to construct the world's largest steam-generating plant in the same area.

The point is abundantly clear: Private development offers a great deal of progress and prosperity for a large area of South Carolina; Federal development obstructs that progress.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, May 13, 1963]

STOP TROTTERS SHOALS

Gov. Donald S. Russell is expected to give his decision on the controversial Trotters Shoals project soon after he receives a special engineering report being prepared for him by President Thomas F. Jones of the University of South Carolina. The weight of the Governor's office is likely to be felt in this matter in the near future.

We hope that Governor Russell will apply this weight against construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River. As leading South Carolinians have testified, building of this Government dam would deprive South Carolina of industrial payrolls and jobs that its people need.

Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN recently pointed out the $78 million dam would wipe out industrial opportunities from private enterprise investors. If the dam is constructed, the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp., for instance, will be unable to proceed with its proposed $50 million pulp mill. This mill alone would provide substantial tax revenue to the State of South Carolina. The mill would purchase timber from Abbeville, McCormick, Greenwood, Edgefield, Saluda, Newberry, Anderson, Oconee, Greenville, and Laurens Counties. Loss of this plant, in order to gain another dam paid for by the taxpayers, would be an industrial setback for the State.

Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, who understands better than most men the State's industrial situation, recently said it would be a tragic mistake if South Carolina let a Federal dam flood prime development land.

"It is my experienced opinion," he said, "that the 29-mile stretch of free-flowing water between Hartwell Dam and the backwaters of Clark Hill represents the finest industrial area in the entire Southeast."

South Carolina can't afford to flood its economic future to please those who dream of public power empires. The State's chief assets are land and abundant supplies of fresh water. These assets must be put to work, through the agency of private enterprise, to produce jobs for South Carolinians and income for the essential projects of the counties and the State.

We hope that Governor Russell, an experienced businessman, will prepare his message on Trotters Shoals so as to move the State along the free enterprise path, rather than the route of Federal projects that don't pay a cent in taxes.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, May 16, 1963]

A WISE DECISION

Gov. Donald S. Russell deserves the congratulations of his fellow South Carolinians for his firm rejection of the unwise plan to construct the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River.

In so doing, the Governor put his administration firmly on the side of progress for this State through the medium of more free enterprise rather than Federal spending. Governor Russell noted that the dam would flood an area where a paper company plans a giant mill. He also said that the State would lose an estimated $7 million a year in taxes if the public power dam were built. This is the amount that the Duke Power Co. would pay on the facilities it proposes to build. The private powerplant could not be built, of course, if the Federal project were to be started. It is believed that the Trotters Shoals Dam will not be constructed, in view of the Governor's opposition.

South Carolina needs greater investment by companies that pay taxes to the counties and the State. Governor Russell was mindful of this fundamental need, in making his decision.

Advocates of a public power empire will be sorely disappointed with Governor Russell's rejection of the Trotters Shoals Dam.

Even President John F. Kennedy has begun to see the need for Government caution in the field of Federal power. In a recent statement before the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. Kennedy said that in public versus private power questions, the "burden of proof" must be with the Government before it approves a power project.

"Deeds must follow words," said one executive on hearing Mr. Kennedy's comment. "But it's encouraging to hear the President lay it right out that way."

Reporting these statements, Newsweek magazine said: "Administration insiders say that the President is convinced that where the private economy can supply power needs as efficiently as the Government, there must be a compelling nonpower benefit to justify a public project."

Governor Russell, in his rejection of Trotters Shoals, clearly envisioned a compelling benefit to South Carolina taxpayers in rejecting another Federal power project.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, May 18, 1963]

TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

Gov. Donald S. Russell gave the best possible reason when he announced he could not approve the Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River.

It would, he said, interfere with the plans of private firms to build plants in the area. He amplified: The dam would thwart a plan of Duke Power Co. to build a multi-million-dollar powerplant in Anderson County, it would flood the site of a proposed paper and pulpmill of the Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, it would interfere with the discharge of municipal and industrial waste.

The proposal to build the dam, its approval by the Government finally or its disapproval can be reduced to a mathematical formula so far as it affects the welfare of South Carolina and its citizens.

If it is built, the power and paper plants will not be built and thousands of acres of land will be lost to the State.

If it is not built, the power and paper plants will be, adding thousands of jobs to the State's economy and contributing millions of dollars a year in local and State taxes (in the case of Duke alone, $7 million a year).

Put it on a dollar-and-cent basis and the disadvantages of the dam to South Carolina far outweigh any possible advantages.

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, May 28, 1963]

TROTTERS SHOAL POWER PROJECT VITAL ISSUE FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

This section of South Carolina is only indirectly concerned with the Trotters Shoals controversy on the Savannah River. But in its broad, economic implications, it concerns the whole State. Indeed, it is a national issue of free enterprises versus mounting Federal control of the power industry.

Simply stated, the Trotters Shoals project proposes construction by the Federal Government of another power dam on the Savannah River, one of a series of dams in which Hartwell and Clark Hill projects are the other principals.

Opponents of the project see in this section of the Savannah River the only remaining portion where private industrial enterprises can be developed. They also see in it an unnecessary extension of the Federal power bureaucracy.

Supporting their claims, they point to a million-dollar papermill which the Mead Corp. wishes to build in the very area to be inundated by Trotters Shoals. The effect of this mill upon the wood industry, employment, and tax revenue would be to boost the area's economy very substantially.

In a statement before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works, E. H. Agnew said that "the threat of Trotters Shoals has made it impossible for Mead Paper Co. to build as planned, near Calhoun Falls. This was also a blow to the agricultural economy of Anderson County. We have planted over 15,000 acres to pine seedlings during the past 10 years."

A parallel situation for the Pee Dee would be Government construction of a series of public power dams along the Pee Dee River which would freeze out the possibility of such a paper industry as is now under construction by the Stone Container Corp. in Florence County, and eliminate the river area along its full course as prime territory for industrial sites.

In his testimony to the subcommittee, Mr. Agnew said that "the Federal Government is already the biggest land owner, property manager, renter, mover, hauler, medical clinician, lender, mortgage banker, employer, spender, debtor, taxer (not taxpayer), and the biggest insurance company in all history. There is no sense in saying that it must be the biggest producer of electric current in order to complete the job of rural electrification which is 98 percent complete already."

Trotters Shoals, he added, would be built altogether with tax funds. It would never return any tax income to any government—county, State, or Federal.

Moreover, it would dry up sources of tax revenue by eliminating private industrial development in the Trotters Shoals area, with all the implications of such development in terms of employment, development, and consumption of natural resources, and additional tax revenue from individual and corporate sources.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Apr. 28, 1963]

WE OPPOSE TROTTERS SHOALS

When plans were advanced some 20 years ago for development of the Savannah River, residents of this area—both in Georgia and South Carolina—were advised that an 11-dam complex would be required to effect the Government's program. Salient point scored by the Government engineers was that these were to be multipurpose dams designed to provide flood control, navigation, water supply, recreation, as well as electric power.

Both the Chronicle and the Herald endorsed the program. In the years since they have supported that original concept. We hailed the construction of the Clark Hill Dam and, later, Hartwell Dam. In the instance of the latter we were told that it was necessary to raise the level of the river below Augusta and to lower the water temperature for the Savannah River Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now, however, we find that proponents of Trotters Shoals Dam have apparently lost sight of that original concept. In their advocacy of the project they are content that it will be, first and foremost, a dam to produce hydro-electric power. Only in a "minor, secondary way," as one proponent told us, will it aid flood control.

On that basis, therefore, the Chronicle-Herald finds itself unable to lend its support to the proposed dam, which would be located near Elberton. To do so would be to give full endorsement to public power. This we do not propose to do.

While that is our primary motive in opposing the Trotters Shoals project, we do not lose sight of the fact that if the Government does not construct its dam, that area of Georgia and South Carolina will reap an even larger financial benefit by way of private enterprise.

It is our understanding that if no Government dam is ordered, Duke Power Co. proposes to erect a huge power plant in Anderson County which will produce approximately 10 times the electric power that would be generated at Trotters Shoals. In addition, the Mead Corp. has a site at Calhoun Falls on which it tentatively plans to build a $40 million paperboard plant employing some 1,400 men for construction and between 600 and 650 on a regular basis thereafter. It would have a payroll of some $6 million and a wood-purchasing program amounting to some $9 million annually.

If a dam is constructed at Trotters Shoals, the Mead site would be flooded.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee also indicates that other industrial sites would be lost. Additionally, the Trotters Shoals Dam would substantially decrease the "bold" waterflow, which, while not militating against all industry that might want to locate between Hartwell and Clark Hill, would materially limit the type.

We do not believe that the people of either Georgia or South Carolina are willing to sacrifice—nor should they be asked to sacrifice—potential industrial sites in order for the Southeastern Power Administration to be able, as Administrator Charles Leavy testified, to market power for the Interior Department. Yet that is what would occur if Congress authorizes the Trotters Shoals Dam.

While it had been commonly believed that it was only South Carolina that was against the public power dam, and that Georgia wanted it, a surprisingly large number of Georgians have appeared before the subcommittee hearing in Washington to oppose the plan. Many South Carolinians also have voiced their objections.

Of them all, we like what 15-year-old Sam W. Jacks, Jr., of Abbeville, S.C., had to say in his testimony:

"We boys and girls bitterly oppose Trotters Shoals because we'll have to look other places for work since there will be none at home if Trotters Shoals is built."

[From the Macon News, May 6, 1963]

DOES GEORGIA WANT INDUSTRY?

Gov. Carl E. Sanders recently returned from an industry-hunting trip to New York. Well and good. But the Governor should now turn his attention toward his hometown area where industry may take a beating.

Encouragement of industry is absolutely necessary if a State is to create a climate favorable to new factories and plants. Yet the Savannah River area may lose valuable industrial facilities because not enough Georgians are fighting to keep an unjustified public power facility out and needed private enterprise in.

The Federal Southeastern Power Administration wants to build a high-level dam at Trotters Shoals on the river separating Georgia and South Carolina. It is unneeded. There are two other dams, Hartwell and Clark Hill, less than 50 miles away. The proposed dam would cost many millions but the amount of electricity developed would benefit only a comparatively few people along REA lines. Already there are recreational facilities in the area far superior to other areas.

Most important, the flooding which would result would drive away two important industries, and possibly others who would later move into this part of the country.

Duke Power Co. wants to build a private powerplant which would produce 10 to 20 times as much electricity as the proposed public facility. Anderson County, S.C., would benefit by approximately $3 million a year in taxes.

Mead Corp. wants to construct a pulp and papermill at Calhoun Falls. It would be a $40 million plant. Some 1,400 workers would be hired for construction and 200 of the estimated 600 operating employees would probably come from Georgia. About $6 million of the $9 million worth of wood needed annually would be purchased in Georgia. Approximately $400,000 a year in taxes from construction of the Mead plant alone would accrue to Abbeville County, S.C.

These obvious industrial advantages to Georgia and South Carolina will be lost if the empire-happy Federal power officials manage to sell Congress that their plans should be carried out. A potentially fine industrial stretch along the Savannah River will be made useless for the location of plants and factories from now on.

We urge Governor Sanders to use his influence against congressional authorization for the $78.7 million Trotters Shoals project. We urge all Georgians interested in economic growth and industrial expansion in this State to request their Congressmen to do likewise.

[From the McDuffie Progress, May 9, 1963]

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS GOVERNMENT

The proposed Trotters Shoals dam between Clark Hill backwaters and Hartwell dam seems to have turned into a Federal Government versus private enterprise controversy since two large corporations testified in hearings recently that they intended to establish plants in the area to be flooded by the dam.

And, at the moment anyway, private enterprise seems to be gathering enterprise in their efforts to stop erection of the power dam.

Duke Power Co. officials declared that it had plans to build a steamplant in the area of Middleton Shoals about 8 miles below Hartwell Dam. The Duke official who testified said the company would spend $1.8 million each year for operation and maintenance of the plant, exclusive of fuel.

A spokesman for Mead Corp. said his company planned to build a paper mill in the area, probably within the next 5 years.

Employment in the mill, when completed would run from 600 to 650 persons with an annual payroll of $5 million. To produce the pulpwood needed would require an additional 2,500 persons on the farms and forest land outside the plant.

Proponents of the dam say it is needed for power, recreation, and continued development of the Savannah River basin. The dam would provide power for REA lines.

There is nothing wrong, of course, with the Government building a dam. However, since these two large companies, both reputable firms, have testified that they plan to construct plants which will provide employment for so many in both North Carolina and Georgia, it seems the Government could find another site just as good for its proposed dam.

The paper plant, particularly, could have a tremendous effect on the already sagging pulpwood business in this area. We hope they get an opportunity to build their plant.

But, either way, it's refreshing to see so many people take a stand for private enterprise.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, May 16, 1963]

DECISION FOUNDED ON FACTS

We share the elation of those foes of the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam who see in the opposition of South Carolina Gov. Donald Russell the death knell of this public power project.

Ostensibly designed for the prime purpose of augmenting the supply of electrical energy disbursed by the Southeastern Power Administration, the proposed dam flies in the face of wholesome economics and sound resources management.

It would, were it to be constructed, very likely eliminate any possibility of either the Duke Power Co. or the Mead Co. going through with their projected plans to invest millions of dollars in the area. It would provide short-term industrial gains to the detriment of long-range financial benefits; it would inundate and make valueless some eight industrial sites, two of which are planned to be used by Duke and Mead.

These were factors taken into consideration by Governor Russell in the opposition he voiced to the proposed Federal dam. The Governor had solid facts on which to base his conclusions.

Some of them could have come from an address made recently on the floor of the House by Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR., a Republican, from Ohio, and a member of the Public Works Committee. It questioned why Secretary of the Interior Udall continues to push for construction of Trotters Shoals Dam in light of the economic statistics involved.

Trotters Shoals would be constructed with some 78,700,000 tax dollars; it would flood in excess of 22,000 acres of land, remove them from the tax books and eliminate—through this inundation—eight major industrial sites. Maintenance and operation cost of the dam would come to some $483,000 annually; employment figures have not been revealed.

If Trotters Shoals Dam is not constructed, said HARSHA, the Mead Co. plans to build a $40 million paper plant at the site, and Duke Power Co. is expected to build a steamplant at an estimated cost of $210 million.

Each would be built with private capital, not tax dollars, and each would contribute immeasurably—more so than would a Federal dam—to employment and prosperity in the areas of South Carolina and Georgia (Abbeville and Elbert Counties) in which Trotters Shoals Dam is proposed.

"Mead," said Harsha, "would employ 1,400 men for 2 years in constructing its plant." New capital investment, creating new construction jobs, would be required every year thereafter. When finished, the plant would employ 600 to 650 persons with an annual payroll of about $5 million. The mill also would absorb pulpwood annually at a value of $9 million, putting to work some 2,500 men all year on nearby farms and forests. Freight movements from the plant, averaging 18,000 carloads a year, would create other jobs.

"During height of construction, Duke," the Ohio Congresman said, "would employ 1,000 men." It would take 3 years to construct just one unit of the plant, and he said several units are planned. Additional construction jobs would be required every year, while the plant also would employ 135 persons in permanent work. The payroll would run to $825,000 annually, while Duke also would spend some $24 million every year on coal, drawing the fuel from Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky. It would require some 38,000 railroad cars each year, creating additional employment.

On top of this, Duke's plant would produce 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of energy per year as opposed to 471.4 million suggested for Trotters Shoals Dam. A lake Duke would create would inundate only 1,500 acres of land compared with the 22,000 of the Federal project.

Additionally, Mead would pay local, State and Federal taxes amounting to some $3.8 million annually, while Duke would pay an additional $13.3 million.

"If Trotters Shoals is not built," said HARSHA, "instead of spending some $78 million of tax money, the governments would receive over the 50 years (basis for figuring the benefit-cost ratio) some $850 million in taxes, besides about three times as much electric energy would be provided annually."

In light of these fiscal statistics and the pressing problem of unemployment, it is difficult to reconcile Secretary Udall's staunch support of the Federal project.

It is not difficult, however, to understand the opposition expressed by Governor Russell, an opposition which probably will lead Congress to turn thumbs down on the proposed dam.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, May 22, 1963]

OPPORTUNITY FOR INDUSTRY

Private industry now has its chance in the upper Savannah River valley.

South Carolina Governor Donald S. Russell's disapproval of the proposed Trotters Shoals Federal dam project has virtually killed the proposal for this session of Congress. Now Georgia Governor Carl E. Sanders has indicated he may follow Russell's lead if plans jell for private development in that area.

With one Governor of an affected State opposed to it, funds for Trotters Shoals are considered certain to be denied by Congress for at least another year. With both Governors against it, and new private construction in the area, the Federal project likely would be permanently abandoned.

In a South Carolina news conference Saturday, Sanders called upon Duke Power Co., the Mead Paper Corp. and any other private industry considering developing the Trotters Shoals area to issue a statement outlining the extent of their projects and giving a date for start of construction. If they will do so, said Sanders, he would not object to abandonment of plans to construct another Federal dam on the Savannah.

This appears to us a fair proposition. Many Georgians and South Carolinians feel, as does the Governor, that Federal funds should never be used in an area where private enterprise will do the same job. But that does not mean private enterprise can delay its development indefinitely and still retain its place of preference.

Both Mead and Duke have indicated their definite interest in locating plants on the South Carolina side of the Savannah in the Trotters Shoals area. Other choice industrial sites lie on both sides of the river in that locality. But no actual commitment has been made. Provided he will give them a reasonable time to produce proof of their intentions to build, Sanders has acted equitably in seeking such proof before he reviews Georgia's official position on Trotters Shoals.

When and if the Governor's review becomes a reality, other advantages of private over public development merit his consideration. One is the private versus public power factor. Another is the pressing need for a pulpwood-consuming industry such as Mead's proposed paper mill in the vicinity of Georgia's Piedmont region.

Just last week, the Georgia Forestry Commission Board of Commissioners passed a resolution citing that area's vast forest products potential and the need for new forest industry there. The Mead mill, if built, would be just across the State line from the heart of northeast Georgia (Piedmont) pulpwood country.

There is no question in our minds but that private enterprise can serve the interests of Georgia, South Carolina and the Nation better than can another Federal dam. We hope the private firms will prove it with an early response to Governor Sanders' challenge.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, June 6, 1963]

DUKE HAS STRONG ARGUMENT

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL'S acknowledgement that the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam project is a dead issue for this session of Congress received the widespread attention it was due. But too little notice may have been given, a few days earlier, to a statement that can have important bearing when the issue is revived.

The statement came by way of a letter from W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. It clarifies, to a greater degree than has any previous evidence, the question of the proposed Federal project's compatibility with the steam generating plant Duke wants to build in the same section of the river valley. And it points up the unfortunate result of Congress' failure to approve the Duke project last year.

Challenging JOHNSTON'S charge that politics motivated Duke's decision to postpone its plant last fall, McGuire said the Senator "completely overlooks the change in the situation between August 10 (when Duke said it would build the plant) and November 15 (when the power company postponed its plans), which necessitated the postponement of Duke's plant. This change was the adjournment of Congress in October without passing a bill to authorize the construction of the dam needed for our steam plant."

McGuire added:

"We had repeatedly emphasized the necessity for Congress granting approval for our dam before it adjourned. The failure of Congress to pass our bill * * * compelled our company to provide the needed generation at a plant which would be ready when needed. This was done at a location in North Carolina where no congressional authorization was required. I do not believe I can more clearly state the effect of the failure of Congress to act."

Establishment of the plant in North Carolina, McGuire indicated, has not eliminated plans for the Savannah River facility. But it has delayed the need for additional power from this potential source until 1970 or 1975. Construction, of course, would begin well in advance of operation of such a plant.

Insofar as compatibility is concerned, the Duke president said original Corps of Engineers plans for the Trotters Shoals facility were compatible with Duke's proposal. Recently, however, the Federal Engineers injected into the Trotters Shoals project the possibility of building it so as to install "pump-back" at the Hartwell Dam. Such a development, said McGuire, would so affect Duke's plans as to create "a problem of compatibility * * * which we had not understood to have existed theretofore."

Many original supporters of the Federal project based their positions in part on the apparent compatibility between the two proposed power developments. If revised plans of the Corps of Engineers bring it down to a question of private power versus public power, they may want to reassess their stands.

Insofar as this newspaper is concerned, the arguments of opponents already outweighed the flimsy justification offered by proponents of another Federal power project in the Savannah River Basin. If it develops that the public power facility would definitely rule out plans for a worthwhile private investment, that factor just adds more weight on the heavy side of the scales.

[From the Advocate-Democrat, Crawfordville, Ga.]

FREE ENTERPRISE AND TROTTERS SHOALS

The Augusta Chronicle-Herald has editorially opposed the Government building Trotters Shoals Dam on the Savannah River near Calhoun Falls, S.C.

The Augusta paper says it doesn't intend to give its full endorsement to public power. We agree with the Augusta paper.

We understand that Duke Power Co. intends to erect a huge powerplant in Anderson County, S.C., which will produce more than 20 times the electric power that the Government would generate.

The Mead Paper Corp. has a site at Calhoun Falls on which it intends to build a $40 million paperboard plant that will employ some 1,400 men for construction and between 600 and 650 on a regular basis.

The wood-purchasing program would reach into this county and amount to some $9 million annually. We need more markets for our pulpwood. It is estimated the mill would have a payroll of some $8 million.

Twelve Georgia civic clubs and organizations are supporting a resolution for the Mead Corp. to build a pulp mill at their site.

Let's give free enterprise an opportunity to do a job instead of Government spending.

[From the News-Reporter, Washington, Ga.]

MEAD VERSUS TROTTERS SHOALS

It is our belief that neither the people of Georgia nor South Carolina are willing to sacrifice potential industry sites in order for the Southeastern Power Administration to be able, as administrators testified in Washington last week, to market power for the Interior Department. Nor should these people be asked to make this sacrifice. Yet, that is what would happen if Congress authorizes the Trotters Shoals Dam at Calhoun Falls.

It has been commonly believed that it was only South Carolina that was against the public power dam, and that Georgia wanted it. A surprisingly large number of Georgians appeared before the subcommittee hearing in Washington last week to oppose the plan. Many South Carolinians also have voiced their objections.

Of the 300,000 acres in Wilkes County, some 70 percent or 210,000 acres are pine and hardwood forest lands. These forest lands have been, by far, our most important economic hope. Within a 50-mile radius of the proposed site of the Mead plant at Calhoun Falls, there are 5,026,560 acres of land. About 70 percent of this land is pine and hardwood forest land, as in the case of Wilkes County. Thus we see that within 50 miles of the proposed site of the Mead plant, there are about 3,518,592 acres of pine and hardwood forest lands. Of course, much pulpwood would be shipped from even greater distances than 50 miles. The economic value of having such a plant as Mead proposes to build, located in this great forest area, would be tremendous. The advantages of landowners and the general economy of the whole area would be very significant.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that if the Government does not construct its dam, this area of Georgia and South Carolina will reap an even larger financial benefit by way of private enterprise.

BIG DAM FOOLISHNESS

(Report to the people by STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina)

MAY 13, 1963.

A matter which has until recently been a local issue on both sides of the Savannah River, in South Carolina and Georgia, is attracting national attention. This is the proposal to construct another big Government dam across the Savannah at Trotters Shoals in Abbeville County. Because of its effects on South Carolina, I have given this matter great study, and have concluded that this project is not in the best interest of our State or Nation, for the following reasons:

First, Duke Power Co. has offered to build the world's largest steam generating plant in Anderson County near the Trotters Shoals site, but the company has indicated it would not do so if the Federal Government builds the Trotters Shoals hydroelectric power dam. Duke would build a small 32-foot dam which would not adversely affect development of the Savannah River Valley. The Government dam would cost $78.7 million to construct, and it would be so high that it would flood 24,000 acres of land, including some of the best industrial sites in this country. The Duke plant would provide 25 times the electric power proposed by Trotters Shoals, and since steampower can be generated cheaper than hydroelectric power, the Duke officials have testified that they would provide power to REA customers at a cheaper rate than could the Government dam. Mr. Hugh Agnew, former president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, has also testified to this effect. In addition to this, the Duke plant would pay $7.4 million annually in taxes to the Federal Government and $6 million annually in State and local taxes. The Government dam, of course, would pay no taxes, only cost tax dollars.

Second, the Mead Pulp & Paper Corp. has announced its plans to build a $40 to $50 million plant on the Savannah River in Abbeville County. However, the company has stated that it could not erect this plant if the Trotters Shoals Government dam is approved, because the Government dam would flood its site.

The papermill would provide employment for 675 persons with an average annual payroll of $5 million. The average per annum wage would be $6,600. An additional 650 persons would be given employment in the woods, and an annual pulpwood market of $9½ million would be created, netting for pulpwood producers more than $1.3 million aditional above the amount they would receive if the same wood were delivered to coastal mills. The tax gains for all levels of Government would be $4 million annually. Over a 50-year period, taxes from Duke and Mead, not to mention other potential industries, would total almost $1 billion.

Third, if the Government dam is constructed, not only would the Duke and Mead sites be destroyed, but other sites for industries already making plans to build along the remaining 29 miles of free-flowing water on the Savannah River, between the backwaters of the Clarks Hill Reservoir and the Hartwell Dam, would be destroyed. This would leave this area a virtual industrial desert.

Fourth, the question boils down essentially to one of development of the area by our free enterprise system or the Federal Government. In this case, private enterprise is both willing and able to develop the area. In addition, private enterprise could provide cheaper power, and 25 times as much power, as could the Government dam.

Fifth, with the Federal Government already owing $308 billion, which together with other U.S. obligations and commitments total about $1¼ trillion, we should not commit the Government to new projects, unless absolutely essential. A minimal figure for Trotters Shoals construction, $87.7 million, is no small sum.

Sixth, the Government dam would not provide major multiple benefits, as claimed for Government hydroelectric projects. Besides providing electric power, the proponents of the Government dam have not cited any major advantages to accrue to the area from construction of the dam, such as flood control, increased navigation, etc., except for recreation. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has testified that the Government dam could be used as a great recreation area for the teeming populations of the East. He did not stress, however, that such recreation would have to be subject to Government policies and orders.

We don't particularly need Government-controlled recreation areas in South Carolina, as we have a plentiful supply of good local recreation areas now, but we do need more jobs for our people, increased payrolls, more tax receipts, better prices for our pulpwood, and cheaper electric power for our people.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], has given a very thorough explanation of H.R. 6016. I merely wish to add a brief statement.

I hope the Senate will see fit to approve H.R. 6016 as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

I am fully aware of the fact that there is considerable disagreement about several of the proposed projects included in this bill.

I sincerely hope that the disagreements over these projects will not result in the failure of the Congress authorizing the badly needed work which is covered in H.R. 6016.

Generally speaking, I think there is agreement between the House and the Senate on the projects in the bill as approved by the House of Representatives and as referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works. As it was received from the House, H.R. 6016 included continuing authorizations for a

number of basinwide surveys now being conducted.

All of these are important projects and I certainly hope that we will be able to carry on the work that has already been started in these basinwide surveys.

When we received the bill in the Public Works Committee we decided that a number of other projects should be added to it.

This list includes the projects that were considered and approved by the Senate last year but were not accepted by the House in conference.

These projects include specific authorizations for construction of a number of badly needed projects throughout the Nation.

For the most part these projects were not acceptable to the House last year because hearings had not been held on some of them, because there was not enough information available at the time, or because there was some disagreement on the merits of the projects.

It is true that there is still some disagreement about some of these projects, but I hope the Senate will vote to approve the bill as reported by the Senate committee.

I say this because the members of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate are fully acquainted with the disagreements concerning all of the projects, and it would be far better in my opinion for these disagreements to be discussed and worked out by a conference committee.

I say this because I think this is the wisest course of action for the Senate to take in view of the importance of carrying on a sound program of water resources development throughout the Nation.

I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to get into a situation where the entire bill would die because of the disagreements over some of the projects, and I do think there is a possibility that the bill would die if we began amending it or if we undertook to recommit it to the Senate Public Works Committee.

For these reasons I sincerely hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will see fit to vote for the bill and allow the differences between the House and Senate to be adjusted in conference.

Mr. President, naturally I am a little bit prejudiced in favor of the Cape Fear River Basin. This basin project was authorized last year, and the appropriation for the basin has already been made. We have the money with which to start construction. All we lack is the authorization from the House and from the Senate. It has had the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Public Works, as have also other bills. I hope that the Senate will accept it. I hope the Senator will let this provision go to conference, and let it be handled there, as I know it will be, fairly for all concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from North Carolina for his excellent remarks. It is wrong for us to give in to the House in everything, without doing a little thinking for ourselves. Therefore, I commend the Senator for the action he has taken and for what he has said today with respect to the committee and the work that has been done up to now.

One of the projects included in the bill is very close to my heart. It is in the county and section of my State from which I come. For that reason I am very much interested in it. It was a campaign issue when I was running for the Senate last year. The Governor, my opponent, took the opposite view. Throughout this section of my State in every one of these counties, I was favored by the voters 3 to 1. For that reason it is my duty to advocate the things I advocated when I was campaigning for my seat in the Senate last year.

Mr. President, the Savannah River forms a boundary between Georgia and South Carolina, and therefore, both the States of South Carolina and Georgia are deeply interested in the development of this project.

It is most unfortunate that South Carolina is not as unanimous in its support of Trotters Shoals as is the State of Georgia. However, I want the Senate to understand that I am supporting Trotters Shoals and so are the rural people of South Carolina, including 120,000 rural electric cooperative families who consume electricity that will be generated by this great multipurpose dam, Trotters Shoals. There are thousands of other South Carolina families who want Trotters Shoals to be constructed because of the recreational value that will result. In past years I supported the construction of Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam, both of which are located on the Savannah River. Practically the same people who were opposed to the Clark Hill Reservoir and Hartwell Dam are now opposed to Trotters Shoals.

As the chief of the Corps of Engineers has so ably determined, Trotters Shoals Reservoir is the next logical step toward effective and efficient development of the Savannah River.

In the Senate Public Works Committee report the State of South Carolina is listed as being opposed to this project. It is true that our distinguished Governor has stated that based upon the information he has gathered on this subject he opposes this project. However, under the law which provides for the Federal Government to receive the opinion of the Governor of South Carolina or any other State on a project of this sort, it is important to remember that the opinions of the Governors are merely advisory and in no way necessarily reflect the majority opinion of the people of a State nor what is necessarily the right decision.

The decision rests with us in the U.S. Senate. There is a growing demand for electrical energy in this area of the Savannah River Basin. Trotters Shoals has an unusually favorable economic ratio, justifying its construction from the economic standpoint. I hope the Senate will approve this legislation containing authorization for Trotters Shoals.

I hope the Senate will reject any motion to recommit the bill. It is time for the Senate to act on this very important subject.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject to me; I have discussed it before. On May 22, 1963, I wrote a long letter, from which I should like to read an excerpt. I shall not read it all now, for we are rushed for time. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 22, 1963.

Lt. Gen. W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Chief of Engineers, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: I have been forwarded a copy of the letter which Gov. Donald Russell of South Carolina sent to you stating that he could not approve at this time the plan for the Trotters Shoals Reservoir as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

As one who has consistently supported the overall development of the Savannah River, I feel compelled to bring to your attention my views and some facts concerning the future of Trotters Shoals. In the first instance, I wish to emphasize that my opinions and statements in no way are to reflect upon the sincerity of purpose and the unquestioned honesty of the Governor of South Carolina in the decision which he has rendered on this matter. The purpose of my letter is to urge, despite the Governor's reluctance to go along with the project at this time, that the Corps of Engineers continue to pursue construction of Trotters Shoals.

The authorization for the Corps of Engineers to consult with Governors of States where projects of this nature are to be located was contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong.). This policy of the Congress to have the Corps of Engineers consult with Governors of various States concerned carried no authorization that would permit the opinion of the Governor of any State to be used to veto, block, or hold up any project. The opinions of Governors are solicited as a policy of the Congress in an advisory capacity only and cannot be accepted as a device to arbitrarily stop a project such as Trotters Shoals when deemed practicable and necessary in the overall development of a navigable stream for the people of a large section of our country. The U.S. Congress has been given unquestionable control over the development of navigable streams in all the States by the Constitution of the United States. Certainly the Congress must accept in good faith the comments of the Governors of the States and should weigh these comments in whatever action is taken on any particular project.

One of the main questions that has been raised is that if Trotters Shoals is constructed the Duke Power Co. may not proceed with construction of their own powerplant and that as a result South Carolina would lose millions of dollars of taxable revenue. Ever since the Duke Power Co. conceived of its diversionary dam for steamplant cooling purposes and ever since Trotters Shoals was conceived, all parties concerned have been in agreement that both projects must be constructed compatible with one another. In other words, Duke Power Co. could build no dam that would make it impossible to build Trotters Shoals and the Government would not build Trotters Shoals so that it would make it impossible for the Duke Dam to be built. My resolution to permit the Duke Power Co. to construct its dam declared that it be made compatible with Trotters Shoals or it could not be constructed. The Corps of Engineers' report asserts unequivocally that Trotters Shoals is compatible with the Duke plant. While the Duke Power Co. has not concurred with the Corps of Engineers on the question of compatibility, we cannot ex-

pect the future development of the Savannah River to be totally dependent upon such concurrence of one private power company to construct its plant. We would not wish to jeopardize the entire future of the Savannah River development just because the Duke Co. cannot agree with the Corps of Engineers. The Duke Power Co. last fall advised me it could not construct its dam on the Savannah River as planned and was going ahead with other plans to construct another plant elsewhere to meet its power needs. We cannot afford to wait another 20 years for Duke Power Co. to decide what it intends to do on the Savannah River.

Last summer the Duke Power Co. was lobbying heavily to have its resolution approved so that it could construct its dam and connecting steamplant on the Savannah. The resolution itself, as I have stated, required that the Duke Dam be constructed compatible with the Corps of Engineers' plans for future development of the Savannah River. It stands to reason that if the Duke Power Co. was ready to accept this compatibility prerequisite last summer that it should have stood ready to accept this prerequisite last fall. I cannot believe that the intervening general election in any way could have affected Duke Power Co.'s plans along the Savannah River. I attended the very first meeting when the Duke Power Co. requested the resolution by Congress to permit it to construct the diversionary dam across the Savannah River. I agreed to introduce the resolution provided it required the Duke Dam to be compatible with Trotters Shoals and this was agreeable with the Duke Power Co. as late as August 10, 1962. On that date, Mr. W. B. McGuire, president of the Duke Power Co., wrote Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY concerning Duke Power Co. plans as follows:

We have proposed the construction of such a plant on the Savannah River, the first unit of which would begin operation in 1967. We already own the land required for this plant. Two units are planned for initial construction with ultimate total plant capacity to be 2 million kilowatts. In order to build this plant it is necessary to build a retaining dam in the river to provide cooling water for the plant. The dam can be built only with congressional authority. H.R. 6789 introduced by Congressman DORN and S. 1795 introduced by Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND were introduced on May 3, 1961, to give this authority. These bills are similar to an act passed by Congress to authorize the dam needed for our plant on the Dan River, which act was passed without opposition. Under the bills, plans for the dam must be approved by the U.S. Army Engineers. The Department of the Army has advised the committees of the House and Senate that the Army has no objection to the enactment of these bills.

It was indeed a shock to me that on November 15 the Duke Power Co. placed an advertisement in the newspapers stating it could no longer proceed with plans to construct the dam. I wrote Mr. McGuire on November 17 to express my regrets and to explain that I would look forward to reintroducing the resolution this year. However, Mr. McGuire wrote me on November 19 as follows:

"I note you state in your letter you hope that the project will be approved in the next Congress. Our statement makes clear that we have been compelled to postpone construction of the Savannah River plant and provide generating capacity elsewhere. Were our project to be approved in the next Congress we would not be able to go ahead with the construction of our plant. We certainly do not want to ask Congress for approval of a project on which we do not plan immediate construction and we will not be asking that our bill be passed in the next Congress.

"As we have said in our published statement, we still want to build the Savannah River plant, but we are not now able to say when this will be. We appreciate very much your interest in our project and your efforts in its behalf.

This turn of events and statements by Mr. McGuire is in sharp contrast of his letter to Congressman COOLEY only a short time previously. The only real change in the situation between August 10 when he wrote Congressman COOLEY and November 15 when he printed his ad in the newspapers was the conclusion of the November general election. I fail to see where the future plans of the Duke Power Co. in view of the foregoing facts could or should have any bearing on the plans for the development of the Savannah River by the U.S. Government for the benefit of the people of South Carolina and Georgia. Should the Duke Power Co. ever desire to build its steam plant and require the construction of a diversionary dam, I would be most pleased to introduce the necessary legislation to make this possible. Compatibility would be the same requirement then as it was last summer.

As for the question raised concerning the possible effects upon municipalities and local governments dealing with the problem of wastes and pollution discharges, this problem, in my opinion, would not be aggravated by the construction of Trotters Shoals. There are already two lakes resulting from Hartwell and Clark Hill Dams and the real problem concerning waste discharges, or you might say the overall water problem, will be the handling of waste and the shortage of water in future years resulting from population growth and industrial expansion. So, the problem of increased water usage, coupled with the problem of increased industrial wastes into the rivers and streams, will have to be met by the local communities as the population rises and as industry develops, regardless of whether or not Trotters Shoals or any other dam is constructed.

Another main objection to the construction of Trotters Shoals came from the Mead Paper Corp. which stated that it expected to build a new plant sometime in the future on a site which would be flooded if Trotters Shoals were to be constructed. In the first place, I personally question whether or not a pulp plant of this type would be a desirable industry for this particular location. It would appear to me that the location of a pulpmill would aggravate whatever existing waste sewage problem already exists in the area. Certainly the odor and waste discharged by a pulpmill is most undesirous. While the U.S. Government does not directly control waste and sewage being dumped into the streams and rivers, this being primarily a State and local problem to control, the Federal Government through the Public Health Service does have authority to seek cease and desist orders through the courts to stop the operation of any plant or mill discharging waste into navigable streams which endangers the life and health of wildlife and human beings. I feel this would be resultant in the construction of a pulp plant on the upper reaches of the Savannah River. If the Mead Corp. could possibly build a pulp plant that could not give off foul odors and dangerous wastes, there would be no reason why a new location in this general vicinity could not be found by Mead to replace the presently owned location. However, the future of the Mead Corp. plans on the Savannah River are just as uncertain as they have been for the last 7 years. The Mead Corp. purchased its tract of land in 1956 but has failed to do anything toward constructing an industry during all this time except to issue statements whenever Trotters Shoals was projected. It is my opinion that the Mead Corp. does not have any real plans for a new industry in the foreseeable future at this location and even if it did have, this would not justify penalizing the future development of this great stretch of the Savannah River where Trotters Shoals would be located.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore what I have said to you by providing you with a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of Interior, Stewart A. Udall, on this very subject. One of the most important points made in Secretary Udall's letter is that Trotters Shoals from an economical standpoint "is the best project in the southeastern part of the United States which the Department of the Interior has been called on to examine since 1950." If this is true, then this is the very best development project the United States has in the Southeast. I think it is most important for us to come up with a comprehensive and sound development program designed to bring to our people maximum benefits from this great natural resource God has given us. The first step in this direction should be the development of Trotters Shoals and I am urging that authorization for and construction of Trotters Shoals be programed as quickly as possible.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in my letter to the Corps of Engineers, I expressed commendation for their decision and for saying that it was possible to build both dams on the Savannah River—that is, the Duke Power Dam and the Trotters Shoals Dam.

I then said:

Another main objection to the construction of the Trotters Shoals Dam came from the Mead Paper Corp. which stated that it expected to build a new plant sometime in the future on a site which would be flooded if Trotters Shoals were to be constructed. In the first place, I personally question whether or not a pulp plant of this type would be a desirable industry for this particular location.

Remember, this site is far inland, and one can imagine what would happen to the entire stream from that point to the Atlantic Ocean.

It would appear to me that the location of a pulpmill would aggravate whatever existing waste sewage problem already exists in the area. Certainly the odor and waste discharged by a pulpmill is most undesirable. While the U.S. Government does not directly control waste and sewage being dumped into the streams and rivers, this being primarily a State and local problem to control, the Federal Government through the Public Health Service does have authority to seek cease and desist orders through the courts to stop the operation of any plant or mill discharging waste into navigable streams which endangers the life and health of wildlife and human beings. I feel this would be resultant in the construction of a pulp plant on the upper reaches of the Savannah River. If the Mead Corp. could possibly build a pulp plant that could not give off foul odors and dangerous wastes, there would be no reason why a new location in this general vicinity could not be found by Mead to replace the presently owned location. However, the future of the Mead Corp. plans on the Savannah River are just as uncertain as they have been for the last 7 years. The Mead Corp. purchased its tract of land in 1956 but has failed to do anything toward constructing an industry during all this time except to issue statements whenever Trotters Shoals was projected. It is my opinion that the Mead Paper Corp. does not have any real plans for a new industry in the foreseeable future at this location and even if it did have, this would not justify penalizing the future development of this great stretch of

the Savannah River where Trotters Shoals would be located.

I strongly favor the construction of both the Duke Power Co. Dam and the Trotters Shoals Dam. I have corresponded with the Duke Power Co. at various times. Under date of November 19, 1962, I received a letter from W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., which reads as follows:

DUKE POWER CO.,
Charlotte, N.C. November 19, 1962.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
U.S. Senator,
Spartanburg, S.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: Thank you very much for your letter of November 17 in regard to our statement of November 15 relative to our proposed Savannah River plant.

I note you state in your letter you hope that the project will be approved in the next Congress. Our statement makes clear that we have been compelled to postpone construction of the Savannah River plant and provide generating capacity elsewhere. Were our project to be approved in the next Congress we would not be able to go ahead with the construction of our plant. We certainly do not want to ask Congress for approval of a project on which we do not plan immediate construction and we will not be asking that our bill be passed in the next Congress.

I desire the Senators to realize why we were not pushing the Duke Power Co. for this particular plant. I conclude my reading of the letter:

As we have said in our published statement, we still want to build the Savannah River plant, but we are not now able to say when this will be. We appreciate very much your interest in our project and your efforts in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,
W. B. MCGUIRE,
President.

I replied to Mr. McGuire on December 3. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 3, 1962.

Mr. W. B. MCGUIRE,
President, Duke Power Co., Charlotte, N.C.

DEAR MR. MCGUIRE: With reference to your letter of November 19, I wish to express deep regret over the fact that Duke Power Co. has decided not to go forward with construction of the Savannah River plant and plans to provide generating capacity elsewhere.

I am sorry you are not able to build this plant because I feel it is absolutely necessary that more power be made available in this area for the industrial expansion of our State. I had looked forward to approval of my Duke Power authorization bill during the last Congress, but unfortunately such approval was not forthcoming. It is indeed a disappointment to everyone concerned who looks forward to the full development of the Savannah River and abundant low-cost power in this area of our State that the Duke Power Co. now finds it will not construct this plant even if Congress enacts authorization next year.

I would appreciate any information you may have available as to when Duke Power Co. could possibly proceed with this project, as I am deeply interested and would like to be of help in obtaining the necessary congressional authorization.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, personally I am unhappy because the Duke Power Co. is not seeking authorization for this dam. I favor public power and private power. I want public power if private power cannot be provided. Power is needed at this time in this particular section of my State. In my opinion, not one, but perhaps hundreds of little industries will move into that section of my State when there is sufficient power to serve their needs.

Therefore, I shall vote for the Trotters Shoals Dam and shall vote against any motion to recommit the bill at this time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been concluded, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to discuss for a few minutes the very real and urgent problem of flood control which exists in Los Angeles County, the most populous area of my State. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

For many years, Congress has authorized for expenditure by the Corps of Engineers in the County of Los Angeles $289,741,000. Los Angeles is a great and growing metropolitan area. The previous authorization for work expired on June 30. Late last month I received a letter from Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, director of civil works for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in which he said, in part:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Knowing of your interest in the Los Angeles flood control project, I am writing this letter to advise you of the status of the monetary authorization for the Los Angeles River Basin.

The various authorizations for work under the Los Angeles County drainage area project have specified a limit on the total amount of funds which could be appropriated to carry out such authorized work. The total authorization on appropriations to the Los Angeles River Basin contained in past flood control acts amounts to $289,741,000. The appropriations to the project through fiscal year 1963 total $287,139,000, leaving a remaining balance of monetary authorization in the amount of $2,602,000.

The amount of the remaining authorization is adequate to meet expenditure requirements on contracts already in force, together with Government costs, for only about a 1-month period. It is likely that most of the work on the project will close down around the first of August unless further monetary authorization is provided at an early date. Our contract procedures provide that a contractor be notified of an impending exhaustion of funds 30 days in advance of such exhaustion. On this basis, the district engineer at Los Angeles will begin issuing notices of funds exhaustion to seven contractors about July 1, 1963, involving a total remaining contract value of $8,500,000. Under the terms of the contracts, the contractors may elect to terminate the contracts or to continue with their own resources pending provision of additional authority. However, the Corps of Engineers, as previously mentioned, will be without authority to make further payments for work beyond the extent of $2,602,000 unless further authorizing legislation is forthcoming.

As you realize, the work of the Corps of Engineers in improving the floodways in Los Angeles County involves a plan of construction which is closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and road relocation work. The stoppage of our work, therefore, will also necessitate a cessation of local construction. This will mean leaving our work in an incomplete status and subject to damage from floods; delays in return of streets to full service; increased costs for the construction work; and inconvenience to the general public.

The Corps of Engineers has been proceeding under a normal program as contemplated in the President's budget recommendation for fiscal year 1964. As you know, a bill has recently passed the House of Representatives—

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I observe that is the bill which now is before the Senate—

which would authorize increases in the monetary limits for seven basins, including the Los Angeles River Basin.

I trust that the information furnished will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
JACKSON GRAHAM,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army,
Director of Civil Works.

Mr. President, I want this record to show the singular urgency of the situation which faces the people of Los Angeles County.

I hold in my hand several letters from Members of Congress who represent the Los Angeles County districts. I shall read several of them. The one I now read is dated July 27, and comes from the Honorable GLEN P. LIPSCOMB, who represents a portion of the County of Los Angeles. I shall read to the Senate a part of his letter, as follows:

Two flood control projects in the 24th District—

Which is served by Representative LIPSCOMB—

are affected by this legislation, involving construction of approximately 7.3 miles of reinforced concrete open channel when completed. The monetary authorization for these projects, and others in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, I understand will be depleted in a few days. Unless additional authorization is provided this vital work will be subject to a closedown.

The projects in the 24th District, as well as in other areas of Los Angeles County, involve a plan of construction closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and relocation work. Work stoppage therefore will also cause a cessation of local construction. This would mean leaving the flood control projects in an incomplete status sub-

ject to damage to life and property from flood waters, delays in returning streets to full service, increased construction costs, and inconvenience to the public. As just one specific example, stoppage on one of the projects in the 24th District could have a serious adverse effect on the Los Angeles County Fair, the largest county fair in the Nation, which will open September 13, due to the fact that at present work on the project is concentrated in the fairgrounds area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Representative LIPSCOMB be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: It is my understanding that H.R. 6016, the river basin authorization bill, is scheduled to come up for consideration in the Senate on July 29.

Knowing of your interest in this and related legislation with regard to its significance to Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin flood control projects, I am writing to let you know about the status of certain of these projects which are located in the 24th Congressional District which I represent.

Two flood control projects in the 24th District are affected by this legislation, involving construction of approximately 7.3 miles of reinforced concrete open channel when completed. The monetary authorization for these projects, and others in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, I understand, will be depleted in a few days. Unless additional authorization is provided this vital work will be subject to a closedown.

The projects in the 24th District, as well as in other areas of Los Angeles County, involve a plan of construction closely coordinated with local requirements for utility and relocation work. Work stoppage therefore will also cause a cessation of local construction. This would mean leaving the flood control projects in an incomplete status subject to damage to life and property from floodwaters, delays in returning streets to full service, increased construction costs, and inconvenience to the public. As just one specific example, stoppage on one of the projects in the 24th District could have a serious adverse effect on the Los Angeles County Fair, the largest county fair in the Nation, which will open September 13, due to the fact that at present work on the project is concentrated in the fairgrounds area.

As you know, H.R. 6016 was passed by the House on June 24 but has been amended substantially by the Senate Public Works Committee. I strongly favor the House-passed version and believe it is in that form that H.R. 6016 should be enacted by the Congress. Also, as I am sure you know, the House on July 24 by unanimous consent passed H.R. 7638, to authorize appropriations to continue the work in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin. In the event delay is encountered in achieving passage of H.R. 6016 in an acceptable form, I believe it imperative that every effort be exerted to achieve enactment of H.R. 7638 to allow continuation of the work on flood control projects in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin without costly and dangerous interruption.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, of the 20th District, also a part of the Los Angeles County; and, first, I shall read to the Senate a portion of his letter, as follows:

Work on the Los Angeles flood control will have to stop around August 1 if we don't get this bill passed, and it will be particularly inconvenient to many of my constituents because work is in progress on the Burbank-Sunset Canyon portion of this overall flood control, and many residents cannot get into their homes.

He also urges that Congress proceed with this authorization, so that this work, which represents an investment of almost one-third of a billion dollars by the Government of the United States, will be completed.

I now ask that the entire letter from Representative SMITH be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOMMIE: I am sure you are aware of the serious situation and are doing everything you can to try and get the bill passed in the Senate. In any event, I wanted you to know the House did pass H.R. 6016 on June 24, 1963, and it is in the Senate committee.

Work on the Los Angeles flood control project will have to stop around August 1 if we don't get this bill passed, and it will be particularly inconvenient to many of my constituents because work is in progress on the Burbank-Sunset Canyon portion of this overall flood control, and many residents cannot get into their homes.

After we get H.R. 6016 passed, then we will have to get the appropriation bill out, and that will probably take another month. Anything you can do to help this along will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. ALLEN SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of telegrams which have come to me from newspaper publishers in that area: from Carroll Parcher, of the Glendale News-Press; from A. T. Richardson, editor of the Progress-Bulletin, of Pomona, Calif.; from Robert Shaffer, past president of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce, and area general manager of the General Telephone Co.; and from Bob Erskine, president of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce. All of them urge that this action be taken.

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

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge efforts for Senate concurrence H.R. 7638 as emergency measure to continue Los Angeles basin flood control projects. Stoppage now would create serious problems in Burbank eastern storm drain area.

CARROLL PARCHER,
Glendale News-Press.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage of H.R. 7638 is necessity. This money required to complete big storm drain through valley. Small rain during conditions would mean loss of millions. Delay will cause traffic obstructions, inconvenience to general public, increased cost due to contractor having to call off men and equipment, danger to partially completed construction. Property owners adjoining project becoming aroused.

A. T. RICHARDSON,
Editor, Progress Bulletin.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Passage of H.R. 7638 urgent. Present construction goes through parks and housing where children are attracted to dangerous open trenches. Potential flood danger will be at maximum because half constructed drains not yet ready to do so. Will receive water from newly completed Fingerling drains. Cost will mount if contractor must shut down then start up. Present construction interferes with main road. Los Angeles County Fair traffic will be hopelessly snarled. Counting on you to avoid stoppage of this most important project.

ROBERT SHAFFER,
Past President Pomona Chamber of Commerce, and Area General Manager, General Telephone Co.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 26, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Am telegraphing to urge necessity for passage H.R. 7638, Los Angeles County emergency flood control measure. Present construction interferes with main roads. Los Angeles County Fair traffic will be hopelessly snarled. Costs will mount if contractor must shut down then start up. Potential flood danger will be at maximum because half constructed drains not yet ready to do so. Will receive water from newly completed Fingerling drains. Present construction drains go through parks and housing where children are attracted to dangerous open trenches. Counting on you to do the job.

Kindest regards,

BOB ERSKINE,
President, Pomona Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lack of Funds Perils Flood Control Project." This article was published in the Progress-Bulletin, of Pomona, Calif., on July 17, 1963.

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

[From the Pomona (Calif.) Progress-Bulletin, July 17, 1963]

LACK OF FUNDS PERILS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—QUICK ACTION BY CONGRESS NECESSARY

County supervisors warned today that construction of a $2 million flood control channel through west Pomona will stop July 31, leaving the work half finished, unless Congress authorizes money to continue.

About $1.5 million is needed to finish the job before fall rains. A half million was authorized last year by Congress to get the work started 4 months ago.

Six other county flood control projects, totaling nearing $15 million in works, will stop at the end of the month unless Congress is quick with funds, said Supervisor Frank Bonelli. One of these is Emerald and Live Oak Washes, which are being reconstructed in La Verne at a cost of $1,059,000.

Bonelli said the U.S. Corps of Engineers, which is doing the county's flood control work, will run out of money for the works by the end of the month.

The work consists of enlarging existing ditches and paving them. In Pomona, Thompson Creek-San Jose Wash are being improved from Fulton Road, near Ganesha Park, to Nicholet Street near Cal Poly. The distance is 3½ miles.

Bonelli said the corps is not free to spend funds budgeted for completion of work in fiscal 1964 until additional authorization is obtained by congressional legislation. Two bills, providing funds to keep the work going, are before the Senate Public Works Committee.

ACTION URGED

County supervisors have adopted a resolution urging Congress to be quick. Adoption of similar resolutions by cities involved is suggested by the supervisors.

The seven projects are part of the comprehensive flood control program which has been constructed jointly during the last 27 years by the Army and the county flood control board.

Bonelli said a work stoppage on the facilities would prolong traffic disruption, including several detours in Pomona; delay completion of vital projects needed to protect the area from flood hazards and create serious unemployment problems among the many trades and crafts engaged on the jobs.

Contractor on the job here is MacDonald & Kruse, general engineering constructors, Montrose. A Corps of Engineers employee here today said excavation work by the end of the month will be 90 percent complete, but paving of the rectangular, open channel will be less than half finished.

Copies of the county's resolution have been sent to Congressmen representing Los Angeles County, to Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE and to the Senate Public Works Committee.

Besides Pomona and La Verne, county areas affected include Long Beach, Cypress, Los Alamitos, Beverly Hills, West Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think no Member of the Senate or no Member of the House of Representatives questions the wisdom, the feasibility, or the urgency of the Los Angeles County flood-control-district program. I recognize that with all the difficulties under which a group of legislators acts, sometimes it is difficult for the Members of both bodies to arrive at agreement. I hope the bill authorizing these flood-control projects will quickly be passed by the Senate, and soon thereafter will be signed into law by the President.

It is impossible to give sufficient emphasis to the fact that the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, advised me that on or about July 1, cancellation notices would be sent to the contractors constructing these vital public works in Los Angeles County. The notices have been sent out; and now, Mr. President, as we approach the end of July, the contractors who are doing the work are not going to be paid. If they have sufficient funds of their own, I suppose they can stay on the job, use their own funds, and hope that Congress will, before too long, bail them out. But that is not a proper way for the Government to operate.

So I wish to ask a question of my able friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, under whose leadership this bill will be passed by the Senate: Is it correct that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House are keenly aware of the situation in Los Angeles County, which is unique in the entire country, and which does require urgent action by the Congress?

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the Senator from California, I would say that we agree in general with what he has said. The bill we are now considering does authorize sufficient funds to take care of these projects, according to the estimates of the Army Engineers, for a full year; and we understand that this is all the money they could use during the coming year.

Next year—being an even year, as I have already stated, for the RECORD—we shall have an omnibus bill which will provide for continuation of these projects in the normal course of events.

We think the Senator from California is in the very best possible position when he supports our bill, which will authorize these appropriations for 1 year; and I hope the Senator from California will urge his colleagues in the House to support this position and to ask the House conferees to support it, because this bill will be better than any other bill before our committee or any other bill which has been introduced, inasmuch as the pending bill does take care of the needs for a full year. I believe that less than what is proposed would not do the job. I am sure that Senators are all in accord with the proposal.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I thank my friend for what he has said. I am not acquainted with the rules of procedure in the House of Representatives. For example, I have been told that one Member of the House of Representatives who objects can prevent all of his colleagues from sending a bill to conference. I am told that under the rules of the other body difficulties over which my friend and I have no control could arise. My question is as follows: When and if the bill passes the Senate, is it the intention of the distinguished Senator to urge that as soon as possible a conference be held with conferees from the House and the Senate participating?

Mr. MCNAMARA. Yes. We shall press immediately for a conference. We want no delay. There are other projects in a category similar to the project in which the Senator from California is interested.

We need continuing funds for the development of other river basins. We shall press immediately for a conference, and we hope to be successful in the conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. I join in that hope for success. The Government of the United States—the legislative and executive branches together—have a clear responsibility to the people of the United States to continue to completion flood control projects which, under the Constitution, have been undertaken. On this occasion I raise my voice for one of the most heavily populated areas in the country—the Los Angeles County area, which I have the honor to represent. I recognize, too, the basis on which the kind of legislation proposed is considered. It is my fervent hope that before too many days will have elapsed, the Congress will have sent to the President a measure which will discharge the moral responsibility of the Government of the United States to continue the flood-control authorization for the Los Angeles Flood Control District, for after the authorization has been approved, it will, of course, be necessary for Congress to appropriate moneys for the authorization.

I greatly regret that the bill has not been before the Senate until now, but I am most grateful to my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his comment in respect to this matter which is of overriding importance if we are to protect effectively from flood damage the millions of people in the Los Angeles Basin area.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senate is considering a public works bill, H.R. 6016, which ordinarily would be a routine bill to grant additional authorizations for projects now in the process of construction. But the Senate committee, of which I am a member, has seen fit to add authorizations for a number of other projects that have not heretofore been authorized. We have taken the House bill which, according to custom, made 2-year authorizations for projects, and cut such authorizations to 1 year. On the surface such action would show a savings in authorizations. Actually, there are no savings at all, inasmuch as the projects which the Senate cut are in the process of construction, and additional authorizations will have to be made next year. It is like saying that a military project will cost only $500,000, knowing that a year from now an additional $500,000 will have to be authorized.

I should like to discuss in some detail a few of the new projects which the Senate committee proposes to authorize. In my opinion, inadequate hearings were held on some of the projects last year during our committee's consideration of the omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill. On one of those projects no hearings were held. In fact, the Corps of Engineers had not even reported the project. Another project had been considered over a period of 5 years by committees of the House and Senate, and after exhaustive hearings the House refused to authorize it.

Devils Jump in Kentucky on the Cumberland River with an authorization of $151 million is a glaring example of a project that is not only unnecessary, but violates every symbol of economics. It is not only uneconomical, but is proposed for construction in the heart of a coal area that has been depressed for years. This uneconomical project would not only be a burden upon the taxpayers, but would further depress an already depressed coal industry and deny coal miners employment.

Taking the Corps of Engineers' own figures, excluding taxes foregone and excluding the Federal subsidy on interest rates, the power produced at the project would cost at least twice as much as it would cost to produce power in a conventional coal-burning steam plant. Not only that, but power produced at the proposed Devils Jump plant would only be available 10 percent of the time, whereas power from a steam plant would be available all the time.

The bill also proposes authorization of the Knowles Dam on the Flathead River in Montana. The authorization is for $50 million. However, we know that the dam would cost at least $258 million. This $258 million would build a 256,000-kilowatt hydroelectric project, a project that would cost in excess of $1,000 per kilowatt. But the cost as estimated by the Corps does not include compensation to the Indians for taking from them their dam sites and lands which they now hold under treaty.

I understand that it would comprise approximately 19,900 acres of Indian grazing and farming land, which would literally cripple the Indian economy. The aboriginal ownership of dam sites on the reservations of the tribes is affirmed in the treaty of Hell Gate of 1855. In addition, the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 gives the tribes the right to prevent the sale of such lands. Their constitution and charter further emphasized the protection of their lands.

I point out that during the campaign in 1960 our President declared as follows:

> There will be no change in treaty or contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned. There will be protection of the Indian land base.

Furthermore, it does not consider the expense of flooding out a bison range and wildlife refuges. It also does not consider the economic loss of flooding thousands of acres of presently irrigated lands. I think one of the most objectionable features of the project is that it would involve an expenditure of over $100 million for the relocation of existing railroad tracks.

Mr. President, we talk about free enterprise, and even the President of the United States is quoted as saying that when free enterprise can do the job, it should be permitted to do so; that the burden of proof is upon the Government to demonstrate that it is in the better interest of the people for it to do the job. On this project, private enterprise proposed to construct two dams in lieu of the proposed Knowles Dam. The two private enterprise dams would produce substantially the same amount of power as would the proposed Federal development. Not only that, but they would not flood presently irrigated lands and would not require relocation of the railroad tracks. Something that we seem to give no consideration to is the fact that the private dams would pay taxes—Federal, State, and local—which would add to the economy rather than being the drain on the economy as would Federal construction.

Mr. President, in connection with the Knowles Dam project, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views appearing on page 330 of the report of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, Calendar No. 2220, Report No. 2258, 87th Congress, 2d session, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT AND THE CHINA GARDENS PROJECT

The undersigned believe the testimony before the committee raised reasonable grounds for further consideration of the Knowles project and the China Gardens project. We believe the two projects should be deleted from this bill.

The Knowles project on the Flathead River in Montana was quite controversial with impressive testimony, as the printed hearings show, raising considerable doubt on the following points:

1. It is an economic detriment to the area.
2. It is not a feasible project.
3. It is not needed for flood control.
4. It would be detrimental to recreation and fish, wildlife, and other conservation resources.
5. There are feasible alternative projects available.
6. Treaty rights of the Flathead Indians are jeopardized by the project.

The China Gardens project on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon would also function as a regulating project for the High Mountain Sheep project upstream. The High Mountain Sheep project has been deferred. Therefore, it seems the China Gardens project should be deferred for further consideration.

A non-Federal entity that has a pending license application with the Federal Power Commission for High Mountain Sheep has committed itself, during hearings before the subcommittee, to undertake the construction of the China Gardens project if a license is issued to it for the High Mountain Sheep project. The question of license should be resolved within a year.

It is evident that no construction funds for China Gardens are to be voted, and that none have been or will be requested in the current year.

The non-Federal entity has indicated no objection to Federal construction of China Gardens should a license for High Mountain Sheep be denied to it. Accordingly, nothing is lost by postponing action on China Gardens.

We see no justification for Federal construction of a project where a competent, resourceful, non-Federal body stands ready to build the same project and provide the same public benefits.

J. CALEB BOGGS.
JACK MILLER.
JAMES B. PEARSON.
MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, another project included in the proposed authorization is the Burns Creek hydroelectric development on the Snake River in Idaho. This project is proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The project has been under consideration by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and Senate for at least 5 years. The House, after exhaustive hearings, refused to approve the project, and found it unnecessary and uneconomical. Standing alone, the project falls more than $300,000 short annually of even meeting interest payments. There was an attempt to make it seem feasible by integrating it with an existing successful irrigation project—the Palisades. For many years, we have been going under the theory that power is a paying partner of irrigation and that power revenues should be used to assist in paying irrigation costs that were beyond the ability of the water users to pay. Burns Creek reverses this policy. It has the water users subsidizing power. Why did this project ever come before the Public Works Committee? If Reclamation is to build a project the appropriate committee to pass on it is the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but since it could not get past Interior and Insular Affairs, we now find the Army Engineers proposing it before the Public Works Committee, but proposing it for construction, not by the corps, but by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Army Engineers witnesses admitted they had not made even a cursory examination of the project but accepted without question the Bureau of Reclamation findings. Of course, no consideration was given to the fact that uneconomical power produced at the taxpayers' expense at this project would replace power being produced in coal-burning steamplants under private ownership. The fact that this would deprive presently unemployed coal miners of future work has apparently been given no consideration. There is an adequate amount of power in the area being produced by Utah and Wyoming coal-fired steamplants, so why should the overburdened taxpayers be saddled with this unnecessary expense?

Mr. President, Trotters Shoals, with an authorization of $78,700,000 also added to H.R. 6016 by the Senate committee, is another example of bad economy. The Senate included Trotters Shoals in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill last year. The project was authorized by the Senate without benefit of hearings before the Public Works Committee and without benefit of an Engineers' report. This year the Senate committee has included it for authorization without hearings.

If Trotters Shoals is built it will flood out some 22,000 acres of timberland and several valuable industrial sites. Now let us compare the economic advantages of Trotters Shoals as against potential private investments that will be impossible if Trotters Shoals is built. Trotters Shoals would cost approximately $80 million. When put into operation, it would offer permanent employment to 50 or 60 people. It would provide no taxes—Federal, State, or local—and would be financed with Treasury funds at a subsidized interest rate. As against this, if Trotters Shoals is not constructed, the Mead Paper Corp. contemplates construction of a $40 million papermill which would offer permanent employment to some 600 to 650 people at the plant itself, and in addition would provide employment to around 2,500 men annually in providing logs for the papermill. In addition to that, if Trotters Shoals is not built, the Duke Power Co. contemplates construction of a $210 million steamplant. This plant would offer permanent jobs to around 135 people. In addition to that, the company would spend some $24 million per year for coal which would provide employment in the coal mines and on the railroads that would haul the coal. Furthermore, the

Duke Power Co.'s development would only flood about 1,500 acres of land or 7 percent of the amount that would be flooded by Trotters Shoals. This would leave over 20,000 acres of land on the tax rolls.

During the 50-year period considered for amortization of Trotters Shoals the Duke Power Co. and the Mead Paper Corp. alone would pay around $850 million in taxes, and of course, those earning wages from supplying wood to the papermill, the coal miners, coal producers, and the railroads, would also contribute taxes. This considers only two developments that would be made if Trotters Shoals is not built. There would be others. And if we are concerned with power, the Duke plant would produce over 24 times as much power as would Trotters Shoals.

All of us seem deeply concerned over unemployment, and we should be; and we are all concerned about budget deficits, as indeed we should be. It would seem inconsistent for any person truly interested in employment and in the fiscal responsibility of our Federal Government to contemplate construction of a project which would be a drain on the taxpayers while depriving Federal, State, and local areas of almost a billion dollars in taxes, plus depriving thousands of job opportunities.

The Army Corps of Engineers is charged with the responsibility of developing rivers for flood control and navigation. Electric power is supposed to be a byproduct of such developments when economically feasible. The four projects I have discussed are substantially 100 percent power. They offer no flood control or navigation benefits. The only benefits offered that could logically be included under legitimate functions of the Corps of Engineers would be recreation, fish and wildlife, and these benefits have only recently been recognized as a legitimate function of the corps. They are supposed to be secondary to the primary function of legitimate corps developments.

Mr. President, in my opinion the projects I have discussed are outside the primary functions of the Corps of Engineers. Moreover, these projects violate reasonable standards of economy at a time when we are in a bad deficit position and the value of our dollar is steadily going down. Before we consider obligating hundreds of millions of dollars of tax funds, we should at least take time to expose these projects to a complete and careful examination.

I hope that my comments will serve this purpose.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER

Mrs. SMITH. It is my understanding that there is soon to retire from public service after a long, distinguished, and extraordinary career, Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, the Chief of the Weather Bureau. His service of 45 years to the Nation—20 years of which were spent in the Navy and almost 25 years as Chief of the Weather Bureau—spans a period which has witnessed dramatic innovations in science and in his chosen field of meteorology to which he has given leadership not only at home but throughout the world. It seems almost incredible that the man who led the Weather Bureau into the era of weather satellites started his service to mankind in a period when kites and flimsy aircraft were used to obtain not too reliable observations of the upper air. The "ocean of air" has become a safer and more efficient medium for the world's air commerce as a result of the contributions of this man, and farmers throughout our country rely daily and almost hourly for weather information which comes to them over the agricultural weather networks.

Dr. Reichelderfer is a modest, unassuming man, and while his achievements are well known to members of his profession throughout the world, it is well that they be set forth here for his many friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and in the House who know him for a loyal and honest public servant.

He was born into the home of a minister in Harlan, Ind., on August 6, 1895, and it is evident from those who know Dr. Reichelderfer that he well learned in his youth those homely precepts of the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and other homespun virtues which used to be set forth in maxims in the copybooks of our schools and which furnished the strong moral fiber of countless Americans. He was graduated from Northwestern University in 1917 with a degree in science and in 1918 did graduate work in meteorology at Harvard University. In 1931 he studied at meteorological institutes in Norway, London, Berlin, and Paris. As a matter of fact, his report on his studies under Dr. Bjerknes in Norway constituted the first detailed treatise on air mass and frontal concepts which was available to most professional meteorologists in the United States. His alma mater in 1939 recognized his contributions to meteorology and awarded him an honorary doctor of science degree.

The professional career of Dr. Reichelderfer commenced in 1918 when he was commissioned an ensign in the U.S. Navy and was assigned to Harvard's Blue Hill Meteorological Observatory for training. Following service as a meteorologist at the Naval Air Station in North Sydney, Nova Scotia, he received primary and advanced flight training, and in May 1919 was sent to Lisbon, Portugal, to provide weather information and forecasts for naval aircraft making the first trans-Atlantic flight.

In 1920 he married Beatrice Hoyle of Rhode Island. She like many other Navy wives went with her husband from one home port or station to another. Throughout his career he has received strong and sympathetic family support. A busy, energetic man always finds time for his family and Dr. Reichelderfer participated in father-and-son pursuits with their son, Bruce, who served as a Navy officer for 8 years.

The "Chief," as he is affectionately known by his associates, has intimate knowledge of the problems of flight resulting from his experience as a pilot of airplanes, airships and free balloons combined with his skill as a "weatherman." Following the flight of the NC-4 in 1919 he took free-balloon flight training at the Naval Air School in Akron, Ohio, and participated in the National Balloon Races in 1919, 1923, 1929, 1930, and 1931, and in the Gordon Bennett International Balloon Races—Brussels—in 1923 as pilot and meteorologist. Later, as a naval dirigible pilot, he took part in a number of cruises of the airship USS *Los Angeles* and while executive officer at the Naval Air Station in Lakehurst, N.J., he served as observer in 1936 on the German airship *Hindenburg*. He was preparing for another flight on the *Hindenburg* in 1937 when the airship burned at Lakehurst.

Out of the experiences with lighter-than-air craft and heavier-than-air craft, grew an understanding of the need for national and international weather systems to meet the challenge of aviation as well as the daily pursuits of all men everywhere. Dr. Reichelderfer can be counted among the pioneers of the air and space age in coping with the great unknowns. Research in connection with these flights, particularly on turbulence and electromagnetic phenomena, contributed to the development of radar.

As a member of the U.S. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—NACA—from 1938 to its transformation into NASA in 1958, Dr. Reichelderfer has continually pressed for developments which would contribute to greater air safety. During this period NACA made major contributions to flight safety through its studies of aircraft icing, turbulence and lighting hazards.

As officer in charge of the Naval Aerological Service from 1922 until 1928, this energetic and resourceful man organized and developed new weather services and new forecasting and training methods for the Navy. Throughout the period he worked in close cooperation with the Weather Bureau.

In 1938 a vacancy occurred in the position of Chief of the Weather Bureau occasioned by the sudden death of Willis R. Gregg. A committee of distinguished scientists, including two Nobel Prize winners, was asked by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau then being a part of that Department, for nominations for Chief of Bureau. They chose Comdr. F. W. Reichelderfer of the Navy and he was appointed Chief by President Franklin Roosevelt in December 1938. The nonpartisan characteristics of the appointment have been carried out through the years by Dr. Reichelderfer in his administration of the Bureau for as he has often remarked, "Weather knows no political boundaries."

The Weather Bureau first established a network of stations for probing the upper air with radiosonde instruments the year that Dr. Reichelderfer became Chief. Under his leadership, the Bureau has adapted the myriad developments of modern technology for observing, analyzing, and forecasting the weather. Today, the Bureau uses high-powered radar to track the movement of rain, thunderstorms, snowstorms, hailstorms, tornadoes, hurricanes, and squall lines. Automatic stations observe weather in remote areas on land and at sea and

transmit the measurements to manned weather stations. The most modern high speed data computers are applied to problems of weather forecasting. Since the launching of the first Tiros weather satellite on April 1, 1960, the information relayed to earth from seven satellites has been used by the Bureau to provide more timely weather forecasts and warnings to the people of the United States and the world. The satellites have opened new avenues of weather research by gathering data never before available.

Some men lead and point the way toward new developments during their careers only to have some of the developments for which they sowed the seeds outgrow their leadership. But this is not so of Dr. Reichelderfer, as those of us who sit on committees concerned with either finance or meteorological functions can well attest, for he has continuously directed our attention to the new and coming developments in atmospheric sciences. In doing this he has always balanced gains against costs and the potential benefits to be achieved. Always mindful of economy in the administration of the Weather Bureau he like many farmers has "made a piece of harness strap do for a hinge for the hen house door," which while it did not glitter, served the purpose, and in so doing he has risked criticism from those who do not always bear in mind the cost to the taxpayer.

When Dr. Reichelderfer came to the Bureaus, weather maps were plotted by hand at individual field stations. Through his initiative, the National Meteorological Center was established to serve as a centralized analysis and forecast service for the entire Bureau. Weather reports from all over the northern hemisphere come to the Center where they are analyzed and issued as the basic material for the preparation of forecasts. Today, through the application of modern technology, much of the Center's work is accomplished by high speed electronic equipment.

The loyalty and dedication to duty of Weather Bureau station personnel throughout the country is in no small way attributable to the close attention which the Chief has taken in personnel matters. In his first months as Chief of Bureau, he initiated an intensive program of inservice training in modern techniques of forecasting. Recognizing that not many universities had programs leading to degrees in meteorology he not only encouraged them to start such programs but he has consistently encouraged and assisted Bureau personnel to improve their professional qualifications. He has set the example for Weather Bureau staff for service to the Government and mankind.

At the outset of America's entry into World War II, Dr. Reichelderfer was made responsible under Executive order for coordinating U.S. civilian meteorological operations, special meteorological assignments in connection with the development of transocean air commerce, and international meteorological meetings and missions abroad. He assisted in organizing the Joint Meteorological Committee, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Combined Meteorological Committee, Combined Chiefs of Staff, and was member and at times chairman of these bodies.

Dr. Reichelderfer reorganized the resources of the Weather Bureau to assist the military in planning and carrying out military operations on land, sea, and in the air. Upper-air observations were increased, communication networks were extended, and the Alaskan and Caribbean weather services were expanded. Special forecasts and warnings were furnished to Army and Navy flying fields, to the Army for large-scale maneuvers, to amphibious commands, and to munitions plants.

Following World War II, the Weather Bureau under Dr. Reichelderfer's leadership expanded its research program in atmospheric sciences. Intensive research projects have vastly increased the knowledge of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Weather Bureau scientists are seeking solutions to the riddles of the ever-changing atmosphere. They probe storms with aircraft; they study weather on a large scale by means of satellites; they probe the upper air with rockets and balloons. The results of these researchers are put to use in improving forecasts and warnings.

Recognizing the need for accelerating the advancement of the atmospheric sciences as a whole rather than the role of the Weather Bureau in research and development, Dr. Reichelderfer urged the National Academy of Sciences to appoint a Committee on Atmospheric Sciences. This was done in 1956 and its work has been most noteworthy.

A leader in international scientific affairs, Dr. Reichelderfer was an active participant in the planning and negotiations that led to the creation of the World Meteorological Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations. This agency was established to facilitate the worldwide exchange of weather information, improve weather observing networks, and advance the science of meteorology through research and training. The delegates to the first congress of the World Meteorological Organization in 1951 chose Dr. Reichelderfer to serve as the first President and his leadership from 1951 to 1955 set the pattern for the successful future of the organization. Resisting all efforts to draft him for a second term, he established the the principle that this was an honor which should be shared by as many international colleagues as possible. Since his incumbency as President of WMO he has served as a member of the WMO executive committee and in this capacity has been a guiding force in the peaceful application of outer space in the planning for a world weather watch, with continuous satellite observations of global weather and world and regional weather centers providing analyzed data to national weather services.

Drawing upon his extensive international flying experience Dr. Reichelderfer, who is one of the few persons to be licensed to fly airplanes, airships—still valid—and balloons, contributed significantly to the development of the concepts used in setting up the first Trans-Atlantic Air Service Safety Organization—TASSO. The procedures developed and applied by TASSO across the North Atlantic laid much of the groundwork for similar international agreements in other parts of the world and were subsequently drawn upon in drafting the early International Civil Aviation Organization regulations. During the difficult formative years of ICAO, Dr. Reichelderfer's support helped gain greater recognition by meteorologists of aviation's needs. Consequently when the jet age arrived weather services around the world were prepared to move ahead to meet the challenge.

Hour by hour, every day of the year, the Weather Bureau is concerned with a broad scale of activities ranging from the issuance of warnings for the protection of life and property to such homey matters as answering the telephone to tell a lady caller whether she can hang out her clothes without fear of rain, or an inquiring farmer who does not want to get his hay wet, or a pilot who impatiently awaits improvement in zero/zero weather which keeps his aircraft earthbound. Probably no other agency of the Government makes so many decisions every day that are checked up on by so many people who are quick to note mistakes. The responsibilities of being the chief officer of such an organization weigh heavily and are enough to make most men lose any sense of humor which they might have once possessed. Yet Dr. Reichelderfer has a fine sense of humor which has never left him.

During a career so filled with a rare combination of scientific "derring-do" and administrative conservatism, Dr. Reichelderfer has received many honors, some of which are listed. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a fellow of the Institute of the Aerospace Sciences. He was one of the charter members of the American Meteorological Society and its president in 1940–41. The Robert M. Losey Award of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences was received by him in 1943 for "his pioneering work and continuing activity in advancing the science and practice of meteorology as applied to aeronautics." The President of the United States conferred upon him a certificate of merit for his outstanding services as Chief of the Weather Bureau during World War II and he has also received the Exceptional Service Award of the Department of Commerce.

Men can receive many honors and awards which are of an institutional nature during their careers but those who know Dr. Reichelderfer realize that the thing that he most cherishes is the esteem, respect, and friendship of his fellow men. The people of our country would not call him "Mr. Meteorology" but in affectionate yet respectful terms he is indeed "Mr. Weatherman." Yet in spite of all this he has never sought the limelight but has, as any one of his associates will attest, been quick to give

credit where credit was due and stand by any of his staff when they were unfairly criticized over a "busted forecast" when he knew that the real fault lay with man's lack of knowledge of the atmosphere.

Dr. Reichelderfer will be missed. Yet somehow it is difficult to think of this vigorous man in retirement and one cannot help but expect that he will continue to apply his mature wisdom to the meteorological problems of the world. We understand he plans to devote some of his time to "meteorology in promoting international cooperation." We wish him well.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say that I can speak from personal knowledge about Dr. Reichelderfer. Many years ago I introduced and sponsored the original legislation to set up the weather stations in the Arctic region. In recent years I have served as the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee having jurisdiction over appropriations for the Weather Bureau. In that position I have had an opportunity to judge Dr. Reichelderfer's performance, and I can commend him and his performance without reservation.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 28 issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Mr. William Chapman entitled "Assateague Promoter Now Favors Park."

In this article, Mr. Leon Ackerman, who in recent years has been trying to promote this area as a beach development, is quoted as saying that he is "100 percent with Udall" for public ownership. Presumably the Department of the Interior is considering taking over this land on the basis that it is extremely valuable for building lots, and so forth.

I am very familiar with this area, and I strongly recommend that before the U.S. Government invests any money in this area on the premise that it is extremely valuable real estate or that it has great possibilities as a resort area, a disinterested group of private appraisers examine this real estate at a normal high tide rather than basing such appraisal on the glowing advertisements with which the area was originally described by the same promoter who now says that the island "is not practical as a housing development."

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the articles which appeared in the Washington Post of July 28, and the Sunday Star of the same date, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSATEAGUE PROMOTER NOW FAVORS PARK

(By William Chapman)

Leon Ackerman, who promoted desolate Assateague Island into a multimillion-dollar real estate venture, now believes the Federal Government should develop that coastal reef as a public seashore.

"I'm 100 percent for public ownership," says Ackerman, who spent more than $1 million advertising Assateague as an Atlantic playground for private owners. "I'm 100 percent with Udall."

He was referring, in an interview, to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's proposal for Federal development of the entire 33-mile strip of sand lying off the shore of Maryland and Virginia.

Ackerman said he thinks that conditions have changed since the early fifties, when his promotional campaign encouraged 2,500 persons to buy about 4,500 lots on the island.

"It's a different world now," the 64-year-old Washington real estate dealer said. "The people I sold to were buying for their future dreams. No one thought of needing water and sewerage then. Today you've got to have both."

Ackerman also contended that only a large public expense can now make the island safe from storms and uncertain tides, conditions which he said no one considered dangerous when he was promoting the island for summer homes.

His views are stoutly disputed by property owners banded together in the Ocean City Club, Inc., whose president, Philip F. King, said, "Ackerman should have thought of all that 15 years ago." King's group and the Worcester County, Md., commissioners want Assateague to remain in private hands.

Widely known for the religious advertisements he places in newspapers, Ackerman is one of the key figures in the long and somewhat cloudy history of Assateague.

In 1949 he bought 15 miles of beach off the Maryland shoreline from four parties for $200,000. During 5 years of aggressive salesmanship, Ackerman's sales on Assateague amounted to almost $4.5 million.

Large amounts were spent for advertising, construction of a 9-foot retaining wall that later washed away, and other developments. Asked to estimate his net profit on Assateague sales, Ackerman said only, "I made a living."

He also put a large part of the proceeds into full-page newspaper ads carrying religious messages, his favorite being, "If you hate your brother whom you have seen, how can you love God whom you have not seen?"

Advertising for the Ocean Beach development did not mention that it was located on Assateague Island, or any island, for that matter. A typical ad described the Ocean Beach "exhilarating surf," "magnificent clean, white sand," and "sparkling, blue ocean."

It also said that the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and new highways, then under construction, "will make Ocean Beach, Md., quickly accessible to the Nation's Capital." It did not say that the only direct access from Maryland's shore to Assateague was—and still is—a ferry.

Ackerman said that prospective lot buyers were taken on the ferry to see the property and, "They all knew what they were buying. Nothing was sold through the mail."

His promotion campaign promised neither a bridge to the island nor roads on it. In 1953, Ackerman's Ocean Beach, Inc., posted a $200,000 bond with the State of Maryland to help a separate corporation win authority to build a bridge across Sinepuxent Bay. The corporation never built the bridge.

Most of the Ocean Beach lots were 100 by 200 feet and sold for $450 each. The purchaser could put down $65 and pay off the balance in monthly installment of $10. Only a few owners ever built cottages at Ocean Beach and the big storm in March 1962 left many lots under water.

The Maryland State Department of Health now says that septic tanks would not work on the low-lying reef, although it approved their use in the early 1950's when Ackerman filed plats for his subdivided property.

"Everybody in those days was buying undeveloped beach property and never gave a thought to water and sewerage," Ackerman said. "It wasn't needed then."

Although Assateague is subjected to constant tidal erosion and was sliced away from the main peninsula by a 1933 storm, Ackerman said he did not believe in the early 1950's that natural forces would prohibit private development. The 1962 storm, which swamped the shore and moved the northern tip 420 feet to the northwest, changed his mind, he says.

The Interior Department's plan to begin acquiring Assateague is under study by the Bureau of the Budget. A Bureau spokesman said that a report on the feasibility of stabilizing the island's shore is being prepared by Army engineers.

ASSATEAGUE DEVELOPER BACKS U.S. OWNERSHIP

The man who developed Assateague Island, Leon Ackerman, said yesterday he favors Federal ownership of the 33-mile island along the Maryland-Virginia eastern shore.

Mr. Ackerman, the Washington developer who in the years since 1949 sold 4,500 lots on the island to individuals, said "I would prefer 100 percent to see a public park there."

His statement is the latest development in the controversy over whether the island should remain in the hands of its private owners or be taken over by the Interior Department for a public park.

BUREAU EYES PUBLIC USE

A plan to acquire the island for public use is being studied by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. Ackerman said he feels that only the Federal Government could afford to improve the island.

"They will do a beautiful job. They'll spend from $12 to $18 million," he said.

The 2,500 property owners, he said, "will get their money back plus." The island, he said, "is not practical as a housing development."

CITES COUNTY REVENUE

He said that Worchester County, which wants the island to remain in private hands, is complaining because "it's been a picnic for the county. They have received over $500,000 in taxes and never spent a penny there."

The 64-year-old developer who lives in Washington said he sold his Assateague Island Development Co. last year. The company, Ocean and South Ocean Beach Corp., now is owned by three men in Ocean City, Md.

"JUNK" MAIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when the Senate passed the legislative appropriation bill it included my amendment, the purpose of which was to repeal the special privilege of the Members of Congress to send unaddressed mail to every boxholder. This was referred to as the amendment which cancelled the junk mailing privileges of Members of Congress.

In last Friday's issue of the Washington Daily News a "key Congressman" is quoted as having threatened that unless the Senate will yield on this amendment the House will reject the bill in its entirety, and he indicated that such action would result in the salary of the President being held up.

The Congressman is slightly in error.

First. The provision for the President's salary is not included in this bill; that authorization was provided for in a previously enacted bill.

Second. The salaries which are affected under this bill are those of the Members of Congress and the legislative employees, and I doubt that the Congress will adjourn without approving its

own salaries solely on the basis that they do not want to give up their special junk mailing privilege. As to the thought that the Senate's insistence on the retention of this amendment would result in further amendments dealing with congressional expenditures, my only reply is, "Good."

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the July 26 issue of the Washington Daily News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUNK MAIL FEUDER WOULD CUT OFF J.F.K.'S PAY CHECK

(By Seth Kantor)

A key Congressman in a House-Senate feud over junk mail today threatened to:

Cut off President Kennedy's pay during the current fiscal year.

Grind the multimillion-dollar operations of the U.S. Capitol to a halt.

Keep U.S. Senators from getting free hair oil.

The Congressman, TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma could do so by blocking the legislative appropriations bill, already passed by both houses of Congress, unless the Senate backs down on the amendment it passed against junk mail.

AMENDMENT

The amendment, offered by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware would prevent House Members, all of them up for reelection in 1964, from using their franking privileges next year to flood their home districts with free political mail addressed only to "occupant."

Representative STEED is chairman of the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. Both versions of the bill were passed last month. But Representative STEED has refused to meet with Senate conferees to work out differences "until the Senate backs down."

According to the rules, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, conference chairman in the Senate, cannot back down because the WILLIAMS amendment was passed, 59 to 29, in a rollcall vote.

It was passed over objections by Senator MONRONEY and others on the Senate floor that traditionally the Senate cannot legislate rules for the House.

He listed their free supply of hair oil, fingernail polish and bath oil that they wrote into their part of the bill as a minor example.

INSISTS

Representative STEED insists that, the way things stand, he will take the entire $168-million bill into conference committee in an unprecedented move and agree to a settlement only if the Senate accepts some terribly embarrassing amendments of my own.

The Oklahoman, a longtime friend of Senator MONRONEY, said he is "gathering facts the Senate guards jealously—facts I am not afraid to disclose which will show how the Senators really spend the people's money."

COMMUNIST TARGETS FOR 1964: ROCKEFELLER, KEATING, AND DODD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, recently in the Senate I spoke on the tactics of the so-called rightwing extremists in our country, and what they are doing to undermine the faith of the American people in American government and in our two great political parties, and how they attempt to use our political parties for their own odd and dangerous purposes.

The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, in its issue for June 23, 1963, has provided another chapter in my theme that the aims of the ultrarightists and ultraleftists are inextricably intertwined, though they express abiding hatred for each other. The fact is that while they loathe each other, they loathe with equal vigor the Republican and Democratic Parties who have kept the American government out of their hands. This is not to say that either extreme would not at various times infiltrate both of our great political parties in an attempt to achieve their thoroughly un-American political aim. They would, and they have, when it has suited their ultimate goal and role as the self-appointed and self-anointed "savior."

In the June 23 issue of the Worker, Gus Hall, the verbose strawboss and general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States and lackey of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has outlined the party line for all to see. His recent remarks on "Political Parties and Movements and the 1964 Elections" are reprinted—all 20 columns of them. These remarks were originally delivered in May to "a group of active political workers."

Hall, who urges "unity of the left in this coming election period," warns that there must be no "overtone of trying to take control." His longrun aim is clearly to win electoral status for the Communist Party, his shortrun aim is stated as forging coalitions with "all developments which contribute to the formation of a new political party." But his immediate aim, which is the aim of this American arm of Moscow, is to single out specific public servants, in both parties, for defeat.

After 17 involved columns reconciling the class struggle with a strange analysis of mid-20th century American politics, Hall finally gets to the meat of what he is about. Take away all the froth as to workers' rights, and peace, and the denunciations of the ultraright, and the Red message comes through loud and clear: Hall's first object, and thus the Communist Party's first object, is the elimination of two of our esteemed Senate colleagues, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. But then let the general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., state it himself:

> In each State the left should single out specific ultraright officials for defeat—such individuals as KEATING and DODD, as well as a number of others.

There you have it, Mr. President. KEN KEATING and TOM DODD, two of our ablest colleagues, two of the most devoted fighters of our country, and two of the earliest and most vigorous opponents of the radical right and radical left are pegged by Gus Hall as members of the ultraright. On March 30, 1961, TOM DODD joined with me in the Senate in denouncing the leadership of the John Birch Society. And his whole lifetime is a history of militant, courageous anticommunism. KEN KEATING has spoken in a similar vein on numerous occasions. KEATING must go, since, says Hall, he "froths at the mouth about Cuba." Thus, the crime of both KEATING and DODD, in the Marxian view of American politics, is that they are dedicated American patriots and outspoken and courageous Senators, recognizing the evil in all extremes, devoting themselves to making our country stronger.

It has always been an interesting paradox to me that one set of depraved and twisted minds sees men like Dwight D. Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles as ultraleftists and another and equally depraved and twisted set of minds sees these same two great Americans as ultrarightists.

Of course, the simple truth is that all of these men are neither. They are simply Americans who refuse to knuckle under to the demands of either extreme.

The Communists advocate, in the words of Hall, "a multiparty system." They specifically state that the electoral monopoly of America's two great political parties "cannot be broken by only attacking it from the outside. It will be broken by an attack both from within and without." This is exactly what Robert Welch and the John Birch Society advocate. Both of these extremes will attempt to infiltrate the major parties where they can, they will set up splinter parties where they can, in an attempt to corrupt either major party, and they will establish front groups with sanctimonious and resounding names where they can to do their evil bidding and nefarious deeds.

Along with our two Senate colleagues, the Red party line reserves a particularly high place on its purge list for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York. To Hall and the Communists, and the dupes who follow the party line, Nelson Rockefeller is "without doubt one of the most sinister and dangerous political figures on the scene." The Communist Party, U.S.A., accuses Rockefeller of building a "fake liberal front" on domestic and state issues while never hiding "his imperialist claws and aims on foreign policy questions. He is possibly the most active and the oldest cold warrior around."

But the Communists give Governor Rockefeller what, to any patriotic American, should be regarded as an even higher accolade when Hall writes that—

> Years before Churchill hoisted the cold-war signals at Fulton, Mo., Rockefeller had already been carrying on his cold war anti-Communist policies.

I wonder how the ultrarightists who have also marked Nelson Rockefeller for political extinction will react to that one? His crime is that he knew and saw, and tried to do something to halt Communist imperialism, years before others saw the danger. I am sure that the Governor's early endeavors will be equally galling to the "I'd rather be Red than dead" crowd and to the professional radicals of the right who think that they discovered the menace of Russian and Chinese imperialism and aggression in the last 5 years.

Mr. President, I believe this is sufficient to give each of us, Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, an insight of what we can expect in the months ahead—we will see courageous

public servants smeared by the Communist hucksters and their lackeys just as we have seen these courageous public servants smeared by a more native variety of extremist. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the American people will continue to repudiate both types of deceivers.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my gratitude personally to the distinguished Senator from California for these words. As he has said, this declaration of war on me by the Communist Party was a source of pride rather than concern. The Senator from California has again demonstrated the level-headed approach, the thoughtful moderation, which make him a leader in this body and throughout the country. All men of good will, whatever political persuasion, must respect his criticisms of the radical left, just as they welcomed his expose of some of the mouthings of the radical right.

Mr. Hall, the Communist Party, and the Daily Worker certainly do not speak for any substantial segment of the American people. Anyone can be proud of the fact that these groups oppose him as a threat to their own insidious objectives.

I am grateful to the Senator from California for his kind words. I assure the Senator that I will not in any way lessen the activities which the Communist Party has found so objectionable. It is extremely important, as the Senator has said, to recognize that anticommunism and militant opposition to communism, are not the exclusive province of the ultrarightists, or of those who proclaim themselves as the self-appointed apostles of all that is patriotic and American.

No doubt many of these fanatics are well motivated, but in the opinion of the average American citizen, they do not help the cause of freedom. We are faced with a militant and determined international foe, who has essentially never proclaimed anything except the doctrine of burying us whether by war or by peace. Our opposition to that philosophy must be carefully planned and skillfully executed. It must be directed by those who have studied the problem and know something about the Communist menace. It is not helpful, therefore, for extremists of the right to set themselves up as the only ones who know how to cope with communism. The Senator from California has again demonstrated his knowledge of the real dangers both in this country and throughout the world. We should all be grateful to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New York. He, like the Senator from Connecticut, can wear this denunciation by the Communist Party as a badge of honor. What the able Senator from New York has said with respect to extremists is abundantly true throughout the country.

Several weeks ago I read in a magazine the suggestion that the political spectrum of America is usually described as a straight line going from left to right. The magazine suggested that the political spectrum might well be a circle, so that the extreme left and the extreme right would meet, because on many, many occasions the position of the extreme left and the position of the extreme right on public issues in America are precisely the same.

The extreme right wishes to get the United States out of the United Nations. The Communist Party would love that. The extreme right has said:

> Bring our boys back home. Abandon the overseas military bases.

The Communist Party in the United States and in Moscow would like that, too. The extreme right of America says:

> Get out of collective security arrangements like NATO.

It has been basic Communist doctrine for years to destroy NATO.

Those are only a few of the examples that come immediately to my mind.

At any rate, I say to my colleagues, to KENNETH KEATING, with whom I am proud to serve on the Republican side of the Senate, and to TOM DODD, with whom I am proud to serve in the Senate, "I salute you for the enemies you have made."

CARDINAL SPELLMAN EMPHASIZES MORAL BASIS FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, recently made an extremely powerful speech on the subject of human rights at the dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses in New York City.

Monsignor Drew, in the words of Cardinal Spellman, was a practical priest:

> His eyes were fixed on heaven, but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs.

He "brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor."

In paying tribute to the accomplishments of Monsignor Drew, Cardinal Spellman reminded his audience of the continuing challenge we face in obtaining "full justice and equality" for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. Cardinal Spellman has traveled throughout the world visiting American servicemen overseas. He has seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war.

> How lamentable—

He comments—

> that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together.

Cardinal Spellman's address is a strong affirmation of the moral basis of the struggle for equal rights. His words will be an inspiration to all men of good will, to work together to achieve liberty and justice for their fellow man.

This is a most timely and beautiful address which I know will be of interest to many Members, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it 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 CARDINAL SPELLMAN AT DEDICATION OF DREW HOUSES, JULY 11, 1963

The dedication of the Cornelius J. Drew Houses is an extremely happy and gratifying occasion for me. Naturally I am always pleased when a priest of this archdiocese is honored, but I am especially pleased today, because Monsignor Drew was one of our truly great priests. Selfless and dedicated, the last thing he ever wanted during his lifetime was honor for himself. But the memory of such a man deserves to be enshrined, and I can think of no more fitting way to perpetuate the memory of Monsignor Drew than by giving his name to this magnificent housing project, built for the people he so loved, and whom he served with such devotion.

Monsignor Drew was a practical priest. His eyes were fixed on heaven but he never lost sight of this earth, its people and their daily needs. He not only brought the glad tidings of the Gospel to those he served; he also labored that they might have a fair measure of the material things of life, without which it is difficult to respond to the demands of the spirit. A starving child finds it hard to pray. A family in a cramped, unsanitary tenement is scarcely able to function as a family—to stay together and to pray together in the way a family should. Monsignor Drew saw this clearly, and he brought the principles of a living faith to his people, eagerly cooperating with his fellow citizens to improve the housing, the education, and the general welfare of all the people of the neighborhoods where he ministered as priest and pastor.

This new development, therefore, is dedicated to the memory of a priest whom I knew well and admired as a dedicated public and religious servant. When he had finished a brilliant career as a missionary on the New York Apostolate, at a time when he could well have asked for a light assignment, he came and asked me to give him the honor of succeeding Msgr. William McCann as pastor of this parish of St. Charles. He knew, he said, that he could not hope to continue the great work of this devoted apostle, but he would do his best. This dedication today is a testimony to the success of his ministry here. In recent years when Monsignor Drew's strength began to fail I went to him and offered him an assignment which would be less demanding on his physical energies. His answer was characteristic—"Allow me," he said, "to die as I have lived—among my friends and neighbors in Harlem."

I know that Monsignor Drew would not want his name to be used on these buildings today unless it were clearly understood that it stands as a symbol for the devoted and dedicated priests, brothers, sisters and laity who for more than 50 years have cherished the privilege to live, to work and to die among their friends and neighbors in Harlem.

Happily there is a growing awareness in our country of these basic needs of people. This housing project is one evidence of that awareness. The Cornelius J. Drew Houses is a tribute to the public housing programs of our city and State. Public housing under the Federal, State, and city programs, helps fill the need for decent dwellings for many of our fellow Americans of all races, creeds and colors, and, therefore, deserves the approval and the encouragement of all our citizens. New legislation embodying a creative approach to the problems of public housing and bringing new and imaginative solutions may

be helpful to perfect the programs so well underway.

When we speak of all races, creeds and colors we touch upon something which is on everyone's mind today, and about which it is impossible to remain silent on such an occasion as this—and that is the crying need for full justice and equality for our fellow American citizens who are Negroes. The inequities inflicted upon them have been a festering problem in our society for many decades. There is simply no reason—there never was and there never can be—why the color of a man's skin should limit his opportunities in a society that boasts of freedom.

The Negro is asked to give as much as any other man for his country. He has a right to receive back from his country in equal measure. On my trips over many years to visit our soldier-sons all over the world, I have seen white and Negro soldiers serving our country, suffering the same hardships and confronting the same hazards of war. Yet contrary to every Christian principle and in downright defiance of the glorious American ideal of equal justice for all, some of those same Americans who risked their lives for America—for you and for me—are denied the right to vote, the right to receive an adequate education, the right to live where they desire and their means enable them to live and to receive the normal courtesies befitting their dignity as human beings.

They are denied these rights for only one reason—the color of their skin. How lamentable that some Americans who would die together today, will not eat together, will not travel together, will not live together! This is an outrage which America cannot tolerate. Doors cannot continue to close in the faces of Negroes as they search for jobs, as they strive for membership in some unions, as they seek the chance for specialized job training. Surely the spirit of justice and equality which lives in the very heart of our great Nation will not permit these inequities to continue.

People today are restless and impatient with the painfully slow progress that has been made in solving this problem of racism. The tradition of America is to get things done promptly and efficiently. Her tradition is also to get them done peacefully. In other lands, and unfortunately also in our own, violence has often been the companion of change. That is not the right way in America. That is not the American way. We must accomplish what has to be done working together, as one people with a common ideal, working calmly but with determination to progress and to succeed in making our ideals a reality.

These ideals could be effectively realized if all Americans regardless of religion would drop the barriers of discrimination, if employers would hire qualified Negroes—and provide training opportunities so that more Negroes may become qualified, and freely admit Negroes to unions and to apprenticeship programs.

In the field of housing, the excellent laws against discrimination in New York City and New York State must be supplemented by the active interest and vigilant efforts of all our citizens. Different races can live side by side harmoniously. While emphasis is placed on trouble spots, we can point to many areas where integrated living goes on as it should. One such is the area in the Northeast Bronx where both the Parish of Our Lady of Grace and the neighborhood as a whole has taken the initiative to demonstrate that people of different races and colors can live together in mutual respect, go to school together, worship together, and be full American citizens enjoying the blessings of democracy in action.

Pope John XXIII—in that wonderful manner of his, distinguished by faith, love and warm friendliness—made a declaration on this very point. In his encyclical, "Peace on Earth," he states: "Even though human beings differ from one another by virtue of their ethnic qualities, they all possess certain essential common elements and are inclined by nature to meet each other in the world of spiritual values, whose progressive assimilation opens to them the possibility of perfection without limits. They have the right and duty, therefore, to live in communion with one another."

In this immediate neighborhood stands the Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Community Center. Established in May 1954, this community center serves over 2,000 individuals in 34 different activities. There everyone who desires or needs its services is welcome. Such has been the consistent policy of our archdiocesan institutions in the 156 years of the history of the Archdiocese of New York, for this is Catholic faith—catholicism and Americanism in action.

In the field of education, we seek schools that are honestly integrated. I am proud that our parochial schools, high schools, colleges and universities are open and have been open through the years to boys and girls of every color. Our own new 16 classroom parochial school of St. Charles Borromeo, soon to open, is an evidence of how educational opportunity is being expanded to give solid instruction to all the children. The Catholic people gladly make this contribution to the community and to our beloved country. Better education is necessary, and we are ever seeking to improve the minds and hearts of all our children, and Catholic people make tremendous sacrifices to build our schools and to maintain them. This we could not possibly do if it were not for the heroically generous contribution of their very lives by the sisters and brothers who teach in our Catholic schools. And when this new St. Charles parochial school opens its doors, it is my intention that it bear the honored name of Msgr. Cornelius Drew.

The American Catholic bishops declared in 1958 that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellowman." Only last week when President Kennedy visited our new holy father, Pope Paul VI, his holiness said, "We are ever mindful in our prayers of your efforts to insure all your citizens the equal benefits of citizenship which have as their foundation the equality of all men because of their dignity as persons and children of God."

I had the opportunity in 1949 of sending my congratulations and good wishes to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 40th anniversary, of which I have the honor of being a life member. I said then, and now I repeat: "The Catholic Church repudiates as abhorrent to her very nature the pernicious doctrine that men are born with the stamp upon them of essential racial superiority or inferiority. She recognizes no master race, but proclaims the God-given equality before God of all souls, for whose salvation our Blessed Redeemer suffered and sacrificed."

Our own Catholic Interracial Council has done much to turn the attention of people to the problems of racial injustice. Many of our parishes have conducted workshops and study programs in an effort to further integrated living and equal educational opportunity for all and to end discrimination in employment and in union membership.

But much—ever so much—remains to be done. The great Christian and American principle of equality must be reduced to action in local circumstances and in specific ways. We need civil rights measures enacted into law; but we also need the attitudes of justice and charity to be applied by every person in our society to the concrete problems of housing, employment and education. This is the challenge which 1963 has set squarely before us and it must at all costs be faced and solved.

Our Negro brother wants more than a house in America. He wants a home in America. He wishes to feel at home here. He belongs fully to America and he wants to feel fully accepted here. Until his desires are fulfilled none of us can be assured of the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

America has met her problems in the past, and has met them successfully and without turmoil. We must believe that she will meet this problem and that it too will be successfully resolved.

May we, through our cooperative efforts and our humble prayers, beseech Almighty God, the Creator and the loving Father of all people and all races, to hasten the day when in our beloved land liberty and justice will prevail for all men.

A SENATE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with the distinguished minority leader in cosponsoring Senate Resolution 176, a resolution to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the early days of this Congress I joined with several of my colleagues in cosponsoring a bill (S. Res. 48) for this same purpose. Since coming to the Senate I have consistently sponsored legislation and actively worked to establish a Veterans' Committee, so that veterans' matters could be fully and carefully handled in one committee, rather than, as is now the case, in two different committees.

At present, legislation on veterans' matters is divided between the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Finance. It is not criticism of these committees to recognize that practicality dictates a more cohesive and efficient means of dealing with such legislation.

The 1946 congressional reorganization bill, as reported to the Senate although generally cutting down on the number of congressional committees, made specific provision for a Veterans' Committee, thereby recognizing the need for a group with complete jurisdiction in this area. This provision was deleted on the Senate floor to speed consideration.

At the present time there are well over 20 million veterans in the United States. Their problems and the laws that affect them are specialized and complex. A single committee for veterans would provide a forum and staff for the best and most efficient handling of the problems of these Americans who served their country in its time of need.

In the early days of the 86th Congress, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and I were cochairmen of a subcommittee of the Rules Committee to investigate the situation to see if there was a need for a veterans committee. Our study revealed a very definite need.

Mr. President, nearly half of the Members of the Senate have recognized the need for a veterans' committee by cosponsoring various resolutions for this purpose. I strongly support this resolution, and hope that the Rules Committee will act favorably upon the recommendations made by Mr. CANNON and myself in 1959, as incorporated in our earlier bill (S. Res. 48) and now also incorporated in this resolution.

PRIVATE U.S. EFFORTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the improvement of inter-American relations and the encouragement of inter-American business are becoming increasingly important to all U.S. citizens. Recently an article written by Kenneth F. Sparrow appeared in the Syracuse Herald-American, outlining the proposals made by Mr. J. Stanley Coyne, president of the Coyne Industrial Laundry, Inc., in this area. Mr. Coyne's suggestions for the promotion of private enterprise in South America deserve serious consideration. Among other points, Mr. Coyne suggests the establishment of an Inter-American Industrial Development Council which could encourage the conditions necessary to attract thousands of large and small corporations.

U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere must work toward the stabilization of South American governments and economies. We must take account of any concrete and constructive suggestions from individuals with experience and imagination in this field.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Coyne for his initiative and ask unanimous consent that the text of the article published in the Syracuse Herald-American be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COYNE FAVORS PRIVATE-STYLE ENTERPRISE

(By Kenneth F. Sparrow)

Private enterprise, properly encouraged by Government loans, guarantees and tax concessions, could do a better job of industrial development in South America than by outright grants to individual countries.

That is what Syracuse industrialist J. Stanley Coyne, president of Coyne Industrial Laundries, Inc., favors—the establishment of industrial development corporations in each country.

Coyne, who presently operates a subsidiary company in Venezuela, is studying the feasibility of expanding his operations into Brazil and Argentina. He points out that the U.S. Government has been pouring billions of dollars in assistance to Central and South American countries, but contends that little has been accomplished in this manner.

He recently conferred with Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, in Caracas and discussed with him the importance of private American enterprise in helping to create employment and strengthen the economy and democracy of the country. He reports that Betancourt is in accord with this line of thinking.

Coyne has just returned to Syracuse, where the company maintains its headquarters, at 132 Cortland Avenue, after inspecting the activities of the subsidiary, Coyne Lavanderias, in Caracas. He contends that development of the country's economy through private enterprise would be one of the greatest offensives that could be launched against the infiltration of communism.

"When the people are employed and taking home a paycheck every week, they have more security and won't be so receptive to the harangue of the agitators who seek to sow the seeds of discontent," he asserted.

Coyne was drawing on his experience in Puerto Rico. Nine years ago, at the invitation of the industrial development corporation established in the island commonwealth, he established a plant to manufacture work clothing to serve expanding industry. That operation has proved a success.

Three years ago Coyne moved into Venezuela and established Coyne Lavanderias in Caracas. He started with five people. Today he has a work force of 75. He provides services—linens, bed sheets, gowns for doctors and nurses in hospitals and homes for the aged; uniforms for restaurants, food plants, the ice cream and milk industry and service stations.

He believes that an industrial development corporation in Venezuela, or any other South American country, could accomplish what has been done in Puerto Rico.

An American industry, seeking to locate in a country where there is an industrial development corporation, could have a plant built to its specifications and then lease it. The same private enterprise could obtain loans to purchase necessary equipment. It would have assistance in recruiting personnel.

This, according to Coyne, would provide positive action, an accomplishment that is not attaining the same results under the system of outright grants.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move, in compliance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, vice William I. Cargo.

U.S. MARSHAL

John H. Phillips, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires August 26, 1963.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1963. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Kenneth T. Anderson, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1969, vice George W. Lightburn.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Chaplain)

Francis J. Bartos, AO3061022.
Reynold A. Czarnota, AO3061061.
Richard E. Sprowl, AO3059587.

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Michael J. Cicchini, AO2220484.
Charles A. Riccio, Jr., AO1872915.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Arthur J. Axlerod, AO3122959.
Richard B. Byrd, AO3042550.
Frederick W. Clemenz, AO3091727.
Albert W. Conerly, AO3091333.
Richard P. Hill, AO3075079.
Donald W. Hobbs, AO3114153.
William H. King, AO3089161.
Richard M. Narkewicz, AO3069415.
Frank Panettiere, AO3122984.
William B. Reinbold, AO3111092.
Oren R. Smith, Jr., AO3092211.
Joe H. Trickey, Jr., AO3114644.
Robert P. Turk, AO3091385.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Eric E. Beardslee, AO3111223.
Joseph J. Berte, AO4012003.
Evan D. Francis, AO3110488.
Ronald M. E. Gibson, AO3110957.
Frank W. Grayson, AO3112420.
Richard S. Gust, AO3089046.
William O. Richardson, AO3123619.
Jerome Schell, AO3089984.
James H. Simonton.
Henry C. Staab, AO3111350.
James L. Stobie, AO3089275.
Lane E. Weiss, AO3061699.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

George E. Farrell II, AN3044600.
Mary C. Jorgenson, AN2243521.
Frances R. Miller, AN2244474.
Anthony F. Santacroce, AN3045337.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Chaplain)

Jerry L. Rice, AO3060583.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Alan I. Herman, AO3103821.
Theodore F. Jordan, Jr., AO3068708.
Peter D. Newhouse, AO3103993.
David Orser, AO3115903.
Anthony W. Ptacek, AO3084766.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

James W. Burks, Jr.
Harry J. Costanza, Jr., AO3114302.
William H. Long, AO3113681.
Anthony E. Plotzke, AO3113983.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Willie S. Shuler, AN3111038.
Barbara A. Silbaugh, AN3090015.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

Samuel B. Chapman, Jr., AO3092887.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains

David H. Adrian, AO2210249.
Clifford H. Allen, Jr., AO3004334.
Michael A. Altieri, AO3028414.
Glendon L. Ammon, AO3028366.
Edward N. Anaka, AO3053618.
Russell J. Anderson, AO2224758.
Roger F. A. Arias, AO2210986.
Francis L. Asbury, AO2210164.
Clinton H. Aslin, AO2209026.
Clyde F. Autio, AO3033994.
Gary D. Baetz, AO3026682.
James E. Bailey, AO2211116.

Kenneth W. Bainum, AO3013792.
Carrol C. Ballard, AO3013096.
William L. Ballard, AO3031926.
Richard F. Barkley, AO3005245.
John F. Barkwill, AO3051399.
John B. Barnes, AO3031324.
John R. Barr, AO3021715.
Robert P. Barry, AO2249657.
William G. Beaver, AO2209030.
George L. Bergeron, Jr., AO3012233.
Franklin A. Billingsley, AO2228207.
Walter A. Black, AO3036927.
Lawrence H. Blackman, AO2225673.
Robert C. Bogue, AO3046201.
Ronald R. Bohrer, AO3036004.
James A. Boswell, Jr., AO3005808.
Richard S. Brennan, AO3010593.
William N. Brevard, AO3011624.
Billy E. Bristow, AO3019407.
America P. Bruno, AO3031928.
Raymond J. Bubick, AO2205782.
Lyle L. Bulmer, AO3023813.
Delmar E. Burkett, AO3048372.
John S. Burklund, AO2230385.
Bruce W. Busch, AO3056689.
Jimmie D. Caldwell, AO3031761.
Ralph O. Chadwick, AO3015087.
Kenneth K. C. Chang, AO3032989.
Richard C. Chapin, AO3058828.
Kenneth N. Chapman, AO2210887.
Joseph H. Cheney, AO3021490.
William E. Chess, AO3048278.
Allan R. Christensen, AO2204873.
Melvin F. Chubb, Jr., AO3056693.
Raymond F. Chumley, AO2249048.
Billy V. Clark, AO2246217.
Richard H. Coan, AO3051593.
William F. Cocke, AO2236488.
Philip P. Combies, AO3004563.
Don R. Conway, AO3009803.
Leonard F. Corey, AO2221019.
Charles E. Cotton, AO3035274.
Clyde D. Cox, AO3005435.
Warren L. Crawford, AO3036713.
Vernon I. Cross, AO2208190.
James L. Crouch, AO3027945.
Lawrence W. Crowley, AO3052431.
Richard L. Curtis, AO3018603.
Thomas G. Dandy, AO3008335.
Larry K. Darby, AO3024018.
Ernest L. Davis, AO2207798.
Richard N. Davis, AO3018121.
Norman A. Degenhardt, AO3057732.
Howard R. Denman, AO3028847.
Vernon E. Dudley, AO3024400.
Walter N. Duffett, AO3015526.
Ronald K. Dutton, AO2205282.
Robert D. Eaglet, AO3064312.
Stanley G. Ebner, AO3050624.
Arne Ellermets, AO2209915.
Paul J. Ellmer, AO3007865.
Gordon D. Elmquist, AO940684.
William A. Fahlgren, Jr., AO3003740.
Gordon Feltman, AO2210050.
Herbert R. Fields, Jr., AO2206981.
Jefferson R. Finch, AO3022619.
Marvin S. Flower, AO2221091.
Joseph E. M. Fontaine, AO3006872.
Richard W. Fouss, AO2206089.
Irl L. Franklin, AO3054000.
Robert E. Furry, AO3004321.
James R. Garey, AO3038085.
George H. Gibson, Jr., AO2204885.
Laurence G. Goebel, AO2248601.
Shepperd B. Gold, AO2251444.
Richard A. Goldhammer, AO3011592.
John L. Grassel, AO2248746.
Daniel S. Griffin, AO3038656.
Arthur M. Gustavson, AO3019474.
Edward W. Haag, AO2206210.
Kenneth D. Hadeen, AO3014551.
Edward M. Hanki, AO3030760.
Solomon Harp III, AO3022961.
James Harrell, AO3029307.
James H. Hathaway, AO2206905.
David Hawkins, AO2208591.
Donald R. Hefty, AO2230452.
Edward J. Heinz, AO3031579.
Thomas L. Hennagan, AO3025743.
Richard C. Hicks, AO3013750.
Charles L. Hill, AO2254999.
Joseph J. Hillner, AO2238180.
Frank T. Hines, AO3020910.
Charles W. Holmes, AO3039391.
Ben B. Hoskins, AO2224700.
William R. Houser, AO3048660.
David B. Hubbard, Jr., AO3023055.
Leigh W. Hunt, Jr., AO3025222.
Bert L. Jenks, AO2221174.
James M. Jennings, AO2209570.
Thomas F. Kasbohm, AO2206739.
Walton G. Kilbourn, Jr., AO3012668.
Philip E. Klein, AO2235045.
Donald R. Komm, AO3022274.
Donald G. Krause, AO3049396.
Ronald J. Krejci, AO2223865.
Herbert T. Kruse, AO2224652.
Jimmy D. Lamb, AO3037503.
Roland T. Lambert, AO3040946.
John B. Latterner, Jr., AO3028637.
James A. Lenzmeier, AO3019563.
James W. Lester, AO2238433.
Lycurgus E. Lines, Jr., AO2249233.
Wallace C. Lohse, AO2230709.
Herman R. Luchs, Jr., AO2224786.
Ralph W. Maack, AO3048568.
Gerald C. Malicki, AO3051913.
Raymond L. Matthews, AO1860709.
Paul T. McClellan, Jr., AO3013680.
William W. McCormick, Jr., AO3026858.
James L. McKelvey, AO3027965.
Martin P. McNulty, AO3011357.
Terrence L. Mish, AO3052054.
James R. Mitchell, AO3018459.
Glenn L. Moore, AO2238029.
James B. Morris, AO1864685.
Homer C. Munson, Jr., AO3002474.
Bobby K. Murray, AO3019364.
Edward R. Naylor, AO2250800.
James W. Nelson, AO2238438.
Bob G. Oehmcke, AO2207142.
Thomas F. O'Neill, Jr., AO2209621.
Timothy F. O'Neill, AO3018047.
James T. Owen, AO2208455.
James C. Owens, AO1907392.
John W. Pachankis, Jr., AO3022974.
George B. Painter, AO3006237.
John R. Paulk, AO2227021.
Donald N. Paulson, AO3038882.
Guido J. Pizzeck, Jr., AO3002920.
Henry L. Pozas, Jr., AO3051212.
Robert L. Purcell, AO2211564.
Kenneth E. Rankin, AO3013206.
Robert B. Ray, AO3057453.
Travers A. Read III, AO3027613.
Charles W. Richard, Jr., AO2249630.
Gordon H. Ringenberg, AO3036241.
Neal S. Roark, AO3003986.
Joseph F. Roche, AO3023100.
Wayne V. Rosholt, AO3049546.
John F. Ryan, AO2253016.
Irving B. Sauls, AO3009572.
Donald B. Schneider, AO3052395.
Sam R. Sciotto, Jr., AO2224830.
David R. Seyfarth, AO2230674.
William C. Shirey, AO1907970.
William Sims, AO2252879.
Chauncey D. Smith, Jr., AO3029444.
Christopher C. Smith, Jr., AO3027200.
Robert B. Smith, AO2210577.
Delmar V. Snodgrass, AO2209085.
Robert L. Sonke, AO2226505.
Walter B. Spellman, AO3006212.
Franz W. Staugler, AO3036158.
Jerry C. Stewart, AO3057409.
Arnold L. Strasheim, AO3012217.
Rondall H. Stull, AO3028617.
John A. Suitor, AO2251464.
Bobby J. Tanner, AO2248803.
Cortlandt M. Taylor, AO3050772.
Andrew G. Terry, Jr., AO3027747.
William M. Thompson, Jr., AO2246982.
John D. Thornton, Jr., AO3047621.
Nicholas R. Trifilio, AO3005543.
Robert L. Van Meter, AO2224683.
Maurice F. Vaughn, AO2236266.
Ronald C. Walsh, AO3033797.
Jack D. Waterfield, AO3003518.
David W. T. Watt, AO3029878.
Richard E. Webb, AO2229657.
George V. Wish, AO3015459.
Thomas E. Wizoreck, AO2226885.
John H. Wood, AO3019526.
Herbert A. Woodcock, Jr., AO2225314.
John D. Woytych, AO3007752.
Robert G. Young, AO3022668.

To be first lieutenants

Gary G. Allison, AO3109761.
Lee R. Allmann, AO3102688.
Arthur J. Aparicio, Jr., AO3095557.
Michael L. Arnold, AO3095670.
Maurice D. Ashbaugh, Jr., AO3103059.
Claude R. Baldwin, AO3096152.
Roland E. Barth, AO3105160.
Franklin D. Bates, AO3103650.
Charles F. Blount, AO3099644.
Jon K. Bodahl, AO3096027.
James R. Bollman, AO3103863.
Edward A. Branch, AO3101812.
John E. Burns, AO3103670.
Edward K. Call, AO3101752.
Robert E. Ceruti, AO3105410.
Henry V. Chace, AO3103731.
Jack E. Chesnut, AO3100014.
James F. Collier, AO3101830.
Gene C. Cook, AO3103455.
John E. Cronin, AO3103639.
John L. Curry, Jr., AO3099236.
David R. Davis, AO3106611.
Joseph E. Davis, AO3106175.
Charles E. Day, Jr., AO3103906.
Jerome A. Denier, Jr., AO3109779.
Carl A. Dobrot, AO3105921.
Ronald W. Everett, AO3101555.
Maxamillian C. Falk, AO3100692.
Anthony J. Farrington, Jr., AO3104655.
James W. Garbart, AO3110003.
Edward N. German, AO3103681.
James D. Gillmore, AO3028148.
Joel T. Goff, AO3103032.
Karl A. D. Goss, AO3093969.
Donald R. Gray, AO3107032.
Joseph E. Hall, AO3041274.
Dale V. Hardy, AO3105100.
Russell D. Harrison, Jr., AO3099162.
James R. Haugen, AO3097079.
John L. Hawes, AO3097361.
Harley L. Henderson, AO3103467.
Ralph D. Hilton, AO3110012.
Melvyn A. Holzman, AO3095015.
David A. Jacobsen, AO3041158.
Franklin M. Johnson, AO3097932.
Bruce C. Jones, AO3097721.
Edward T. Kast, AO3103968.
Robert H. Kaulbach, AO3110105.
Douglas N. Kelly, AO3105475.
Wayne E. Kinder, AO3103563.
Carl D. Kingsley, AO3109980.
John K. Kline, AO3110074.
Wilford J. Klump, AO3103749.
Bobby G. Knapp, AO3093196.
Donald L. Koch, AO3100905.
Joseph M. Kovac, Jr., AO3109981.
Phillip F. Kurtz, AO3018997.
George P. Kyriazis, AO3072762.
Andre L. Lachance, AO3103517.
Thomas L. Legler, AO3109985.
Howard E. Leidy, AO3103692.
Charles D. Lenz, AO3106074.
Judd E. Lundt, AO3109807.
Aubrey J. Lynch, Jr., AO3101720.
Arnold L. Mabile, AO3095744.
Conrad P. Marcotte, AO3109809.
John R. McCall, AO3101961.
Robert A. Mercer, AO3109814.
William G. Mercer, AO3109815.
Robert B. Meyers, AO3109961.
Alan S. Michael, AO3103480
Arthur M. Moody III, AO3105746.
Terrance P. Murphy, AO3103987.
Joseph P. O'Connor, AO3103893.
William A. Olsen, AO3103810.
Francis L. Owens, Jr., AO3098754.
John F. Randall, AO3099535.
Garry L. Ratliff, AO3106926.
Eddie L. Rhodes, AO3109604.
Clifford E. Saunders, AO3103567.
Russell R. Schindehette, AO3103894.
Robert L. Sipes, AO3103770.
Douglas L. Smith, AO3099395.
William E. Spence, Jr., AO3106863.
Terry J. Spring, AO3103568.

Joseph K. Stapelton, AO3103711.
Tommie N. Thompson, AO3103663.
Eugene L. Thornton, AO3103664.
Donnie M. Tribble, AO3103321.
Jesse P. Undlin, AO3103772.
Herman M. Vilella, AO3098629.
Jerome P. Vitarelli, AO3099579.
William J. Watt, AO3096270.
Francis J. Wawrzyniak, AO3109923.
Allan P. Weber, AO3100006.
John H. Wells, AO3109925.
John M. Whittier, AO3100928.
David N. Wilkinson, AO3098541.
Edwin R. Wilkinson, AO3098465.
Ronald O. Woods, AO3096122.
Dennis E. Wooton, AO3098984.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduates

Dennis T. Lawrence, AO3129201.
William B. May, AO3128091.
Brian Tilbury, AO3129229.

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Ronald P. Campbell, AO3130057.
Thomas E. Hodge, AO3139031.
William B. Lehner, Jr., AO3139007.
Theodore J. Marano, AO3139035.
Melvin M. Marvel, AO3139037.
William H. Severns, AO3139049.
Walker M. Williams III, AO3139021.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Clifford H. Anderson, AO3129798.
Paul V. Anderson, AO3135414.
Glenn W. Armistead, AO3129840.
Roger D. Bacon, AO3128714.
Raymond E. Bacot, AO3129775.
Samuel Bailey, Jr., AO3135403.
Douglas G. Balan, AO3134981.
Curtis B. Balston, AO3134840.
Joseph M. Barkofski, AO3135408.
Norman J. Barry, Jr., AO3135439.
John J. W. Battin, AO3135445.
Jerry E. Beck, AO3135451.
Larry D. Berry, AO3135504.
James A. Bishop, AO3135616.
William W. Bitterli, AO3135636.
Floy F. Black, AL3137086.
Lloyd C. Blackburn, Jr., AO3134510.
Walter B. Bolton, AO3121190.
William R. Brady, AO3129070.
Walter L. Brothers, AO3129833.
Anthony K. Brown, AO3128473.
Donald L. Brown, AO3134842.
Ronald Brown, AO3134700.
Richard P. Buckner, AO3135986.
James M. Callan, Jr., AO3136017.
Paul N. Carey, AO3136043.
Alice I. Champagne, AL3137090.
Clifton H. Chastain, AO3136084.
Ross W. Churchill, AO3136151.
David L. Cohen, AO3136317.
George B. Connor, AO3135780.
John A. Cooper, AO3135856.
John R. Cooper, AO3135862.
Michael C. Curley, AO3136217.
Danny E. Dail, AO3136241.
Joseph C. Daily, AO3136244.
Clair D. Densley, AO3128266.
David L. Donaldson, AO3135484.
Stephen P. Drayer, AO3135602.
John P. Duane, AO3135791.
Kenneth K. Dunham, Jr., AO3134548.
Alfred C. Eynon, AO3136358.
George A. Fergusson, AO3136367.
Donald E. Flynn, AO3136378.
John R. Fry, AO3136391.
Charles R. Funk III, AO3136287.
John P. Gleason, AO3136406.
Harvey L. Goldstein, AO3136409.
Ralph Goodman, AO3136410.
John A. Gould, AO3136414.
Anthony C. Graffeo, AO3136419.
William B. Greer, AO3136424.
Richard J. Griffiths, AO3136427.
Arthur E. Grills, AO3136429.
Ronald Gruchy, AO3136431.
Gordon E. Gumble, AO3136434.
Frank D. Hale, AO3136439.
Harold B. Harris, Jr., AO3136456.
Richard D. Hennen, AO3136472.
Ronald E. Henry, AO3136474.
Allan R. Herbert, AO3136475.
John H. Herrington, AO3136477.
William J. Hilliard, AO3136484.
LeRoy Hoden, AO3136490.
Carroll E. Hokanson, AO3136496.
Blaine S. Hollimon III, AO3136502.
Mark A. Hulbert, AO3136517.
John P. Huseth, AO3136524.
Basil E. Huston III, AO3136525.
Harry E. Hutchinson, Jr., AO3136526.
Clarence P. James, AO3137080.
Bobbie R. Johnson, AO3136538.
David S. Johnson, AO3136541.
Duane M. Johnson, AO3136543.
Steven B. Johnson, AO3136548.
Johnnie L. Jones, AO3136551.
Orvin C. Jones, Jr., AO3136553.
Leland G. Jordan, AO3136554.
Benjamin E. Kajer, AO3136558.
Robert Katz, AO3136561.
Jack E. Keeter, Jr., AO3136565.
Richard S. Kimball, AO3136581.
David A. Kirkwood, AO3136585.
Clifford E. Kobland, AO3136591.
Henry R. Koch, AO3136592.
Lawrence F. Kolasa, AO3136595.
Robert T. Kramer, AO3136602.
Calvin J. Kreunen, AO3136604.
David M. Kriech, AO3136605.
Jerome P. Lagemann, AO3136610.
Richard E. Lahti, AO3136611.
David G. Landor, AO3136613.
Barry M. Landson, AO3136614.
John J. G. Lane, Jr., AO3136615.
Crissman R. Lawrence, AO3136621.
Eileen D. Lenart, AL3137100.
Cecil E. Leonard, AO3136628.
Timothy J. Long, AO3136634.
Roger L. Loos, AO3136635.
Duarte A. Lopes, AO3136636.
Ramon A. Lopez, AO3136638.
Lester J. Mahlen, AO3128929.
Burton H. Margolis, AO3136655.
Karen V. R. Marsh, AL3137101.
John J. Martancik, AO3136661.
Duane W. Martin, AO3136662.
Jerry T. Mattox, AO3136671.
Robert N. McDaniel, AO3136684.
Daniel A. McHugh, AO3136690.
Clinton S. McIntosh, AO3136691.
Robert K. McLeod, AO3136699.
Leonard B. Merchant, AO3136713.
Bruce M. Miller, AO3136720.
Sharon I. Miller, AL3137102.
Alan H. Monsees, AO3136734.
David P. Montague, AO3136736.
Richard T. Morse, AO3136748.
Walter R. Neal, Jr., AO3136758.
Bruce W. Nordby, AO3136769.
Thomas E. O'Brien, AO3136775.
Philip M. Ordway, AO3136784.
Edward M. Oswald, AO3136787.
Roger G. Owens, AO3136790.
Newman S. Peery, Jr., AO3136801.
Walter S. Penniston, AO3136803.
Carl F. Pfaff, AO3136809.
Samuel E. Porter, AO3136821.
Albert A. Powers, AO3136824.
Robert E. Rawls, AO3136853.
Daniel G. Rearick, AO3136841.
Peter Reilly, AO3136847.
Robert D. Renken, AO3136849.
Dean I. Rhoads, AO3136851.
James O. Rice, AO3136856.
Herbert B. Ringsdorf, AO3136861.
Lynn I. Robertshaw, AO3136865.
Lansing J. Robertson, Jr., AO3136864.
John A. Rosicky, AO3136872.
Robert L. Rushmore, AO3136878.
Frank J. Santafede, AO3135786.
George B. Schmoyer, AO3136905.
Miller L. Shamburger, AO3136922.
Leroy C. Simpkins, AO3136933.
Herbert W. Speckman, AO3136950.
William G. Stickelmaier, AO3136966.
Herman L. Stricklen, AO3136974.
Bryan T. Sugahara, AO3136977.
Joseph O. Tanner, AO3136982.
Henry A. Taylor, AO3136984.
George T. Theis, AO3136989.
John W. Thomas, AO3135896.
William E. Tippett, AO3136997.
Ronald W. Tirabassi, AO3136998.
John B. Tower, AO3137004.
Charles P. Turner, AO3137009.
Joseph H. Verdery, AO3137014.
Denis J. Vineys, AO3137015.
Joe F. Watson, AO3137031.
Louis P. Westefield, AO3137037.
Charles E. White, AO3137040.
Jimmy G. White, AO3137042.
David C. Whitlock, AO3137044.
Richard J. Willis, AO3137048.
Francis C. Wilson II, AO3137055.
Lawrence V. Witt, Jr., AO3137062.
Alvin J. Wooten, AO3137066.
Charles E. Wortz, AO3137067.
Arthur E. Wunder, AO3137068.
Richard Yagoda, AO3137070.
Donald E. Zimmer, AO3137079.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Samuel Y. Adair, Jr.
Terrence J. Ahearn
James C. Akers
Robert L. Akin
Thomas R. Allen
John R. Amos
John V. Anderson II
Terry Anderson
Swanson W. Angle
Michael J. Arganbright
Louis F. Armbruster
James T. Armour
Phillip N. Ashbaker
Thurman O. Ashe
Lewis E. Atha
Laurence D. Bachman
Harlan L. Bagaus
Jack C. Bailey
Kenneth E. Baker
Larry K. Baker
William J. Ballee
James E. Barineau
Laurence J. Barkley
Gary L. Barnes
Joe W. Barnhart, Jr.
Howard A. Barrere
James H. Bassham
Larrie C. Bates
John S. Baughman
Byron D. Baur
Bruce C. Bechtel
Gary W. Bennett
Richard B. Bennett
Stephen L. Bennett
Thomas A. Bennett
Kenneth B. Benson
Phillip M. Berg
Paul E. Bergstrom
John S. Bernhard
Johnnie O. Bernier
William G. Berringer
James R. Best
Richard M. Betty
James E. Biltz
Alvin D. Bird
Kenneth L. Blankenship
Bennie B. Blansett, Jr.
Francis M. Blomme
James J. Blommers
Frederic K. Blume
Jay D. Blume, Jr.
Joseph T. Bocklage
Andrew Bohutinsky
Ronald R. Bousek
Joseph H. Bowers
Daniel D. Boyer, Jr.
John G. Breland, Jr.
Charles R. Brown, Jr.
Richard D. Brown
Wesley Brown
William P. Burckel
Elmer R. Burkart, Jr.
Bruce L. Burke
William R. Burnette
Michael L. Burton
Robert B. Butler
Thomas C. Camp, Jr.
Timothy L. Campbell
Thomas D. Carbeck
Gary W. Carlson
Peter A. Carson
Edward G. Carter
Russell L. Cayler
William L. Chada
Paul B. Chader
Carl D. Chambers
James W. Chandler, Jr.
Richard A. Chartrain
Harry W. Christie, Jr.
James R. Clapper, Jr.
Wilbur H. Clark
Norman J. Cochrane
Eugene G. Coco, Jr.
Paul E. Coesfeld
David B. Cole
Edward M. Collins, Jr.
Brian E. Comerford
Lanny P. Conerly
John L. Conley
William A. Cook
Philip W. Corbett
Charles E. Couchman IV
Raymond C. Cox
Thomas P. Crawford
Richard E. Curp
Gerhard S. Damron
Steven C. Davee
Emanuel F. Davi
Dale L. Davis
John S. Davis
Paul R. Davis
Thomas D. Davis
Richard A. Decaire
Arthur Dederick III
Frederick T. Dehner
John W. Diercks
Francis C. Diodate
Raymond L. Ditterline
David R. Dollahite
Alfredo Domingo
George J. Dooley III
David R. Downer, Jr.
Bruce C. Ducat
John A. Duncan
Robert M. Duncan
James S. Dunn
Bernard F. Ellrodt
Richard D. Emmons

Robert A. Entrican
Bruce B. Epperly
Eugene R. Evans
James A. Evans
Armand A. Fannin, Jr.
Joe C. Farr, Jr.
John C. Fasick, Jr.
Charles M. Ferguson
William D. Findley
Michael S. Fleischmann
Raymond R. Flowers, Jr.
Edward R. Foechterle
Harry G. Forbes, Jr.
Morris K. Ford III
Robert C. Ford
Roger E. Ford
Charles H. Foss
Leslie H. Fox
Richard D. Freeborn
Wayne W. Frenier
Francis C. Frese
Frederick A. Fresh
Kent W. Freshwater
Robert A. Freyer
John C. Fryer, Jr.
Marvin T. Furusho
Esequiel L. Garcia
Samuel R. Gardiner
Charles W. Gearhart
Jon L. Geerlings
Andrew Gemelaris
Phillip M. Gibson
Joseph C. Giles
William T. Gladis
Martin J. Godfrey
Melvin S. Goldberg
Stanley R. Goldberg
Richard A. Gooch
David A. Gootee
Bruce B. Greene
Duff S. Greene
Walter A. Greiner
John C. Griffith
Ronald L. Grotbeck
Thomas A. Grygotis
Richard A. Gustafson
John R. Haack
Stefan D. Haag
David D. Hahn
Samuel Hale, Jr.
Lawrence W. Hall, Jr.
Jerry E. Hammett
Paul T. Hancock
Dorrel T. Hanks, Jr.
Francis J. Hanley
Frederick D. Hannum
William W. Haralson
James A. Harrass
Calvin E. Harris, Jr.
Paul D. Harris
Benjamin J. Harrison
Michael J. Harrold
Robert L. Hartman
John V. Hartzell
James S. Hawkins
Houston T. Hawkins
David L. Hawley
Edward J. Head
Charles W. Heckman
John D. Henderson
Dieter A. Hentschel
William T. Higham
James M. Hinkle
David M. Hirzel
William H. Holderness, Jr.
Stephen K. Holland
John E. Hormuth
Wayne K. Hostetter
Larry R. Houge
Steve J. Hughes
Robert G. Hunter
John A. Hurry
Jackson F. Hurst
John R. Imhof
Ralph D. Irwin
Larry C. Jackson
James C. Jalbert
Lawrence T. James, Jr.
Thomas M. James
Ross B. Jasper
Edward D. Jenkins, Jr.
David L. Jenney
Harold G. Jensen
Jerald N. Jensen
John M. Johns
Kenneth L. Johnson
Robert B. Johnson
Thomas H. Johnson
Eben D. Jones
Larry A. Jones
Ronald L. Jones
Fulton A. Jordan, Jr.
Lawrence W. Jordan
Kim A. Karst
Joseph F. Keeler, Jr.
Arthur C. Kelley
Henry K. Kellner
Kenneth J. Kerkering
Michael C. Kiefl
Daniel R. King
William F. King III
John J. K. Klesch
Kenneth E. Kolb
George E. Koleszar
Kenneth R. Kolthoff
Joseph L. Kottak
Imants Kringelis
Edward T. Kubiak
Sheldon L. Ladd
Thomas R. Lange
Allen Langston, Jr.
Brant A. Larrimer
Thomas A. Lasco
Kenneth R. Latour
Joseph E. Latt
Larry L. Lee
Michael R. Lee
Robert C. Lemert, Jr.
Jung Leong
Joseph A. Levisky
Dee M. Lineberger, Jr.
Marlin L. Logan
Carl J. London
Robert W. Long
Richard F. Lord
Rodger F. Lotz
Joseph B. Lovell
Harold W. Lowe
Jack L. Lowther
Tommy R. Luce
Michael H. Lythgoe
Arthur E. Malcarney
John W. Mansur
Ronald G. Marlar
James P. Marsh
Frank S. Martin
Jose J. Martinez
James L. Marxer
Paul M. Maslona
Dale V. Mathis
Alvin M. Mavis
James W. Mayo III
Larry B. McBride
William O. McCabe
Robert J. McCarthy
John W. McCary
Thomas J. McClelland
James L. McCloskey
Charles P. McDowell
Robert U. McDowell
Alton B. McGill, Jr.
John O. McGraw
James V. McMahon
Garth W. McMillen
Jay W. Mercer
Alan G. Merten
Marshall H. Messimer
Lee A. Mietz
Walter H. Mihata
Conway D. Miller
Warren Miller
Francis L. Mills
Michael A. Moherek
William J. Monahan
Leonard R. Moon
Alvin D. Moore
Victor G. Morris
Michael S. Morse
Warren A. Mosby
Gary G. Moss
James A. Moss
Charles G. Mutz
Marshall W. Nay
Dennis S. Nelson
Floyd W. Nolte
James F. Nooney
Frank V. Norwood
Howard J. Oakes
Wayne L. O'Hern, Jr.
Richard E. O'Neill
Darwin N. Orrell
Harry M. Orth, Jr.
Donn O. Owens
Dudley E. Owens
Thomas A. Palmberg
John D. Parr
Patrick R. Parrish
George F. Pavarini
Charles G. Peckham
John T. Pehler, Jr.
Lawrence E. Pence
Robert A. Penn
Michael G. Pennacchio
John L. Penrod
Arvid O. Peterson
Angelo M. Pezzani
Frederick T. Phalin
James T. Plummer
David J. Polzin
Joseph V. Potter
Peter W. Potter
John H. Pronsky
Gene W. Quick
James D. Quinn
William J. Quinn
Tillman J. Ragan
Robert L. Rapson
Charles B. Rawson, Jr.
Clarence E. Reaver, Jr.
David C. Rechlitz
Jackson E. Rendleman
Stephen P. Richard
Reuben R. Richards
Dudley G. Rickenbaker
Quentin B. Ridgley
James J. Ridgway
David A. Robinson
James F. Rockaway
George A. Roegler
Jack C. Rogers
John S. Rogers
Carl D. Rogge
Albert J. Rosa
Lewis R. Rose
Lester J. Roundtree
Larry D. Rucker
Charles T. Russell
Ronald C. Sacre
Patrick B. Sampey
Charles R. Sanders
Jake L. Saye, Jr.
George J. Schaerer
Ronald F. Schloemer
John E. Schmidt
Donald E. Schnoor
Neil H. Schultz
Charles F. Schwab
John S. Segura
Thomas B. Seitz
Allen F. Shapiro
James F. Shunk
Larry L. Shupe
Douglas W. Simon
William E. Simon, Jr.
Peter F. Simonetti
Robert E. Sims
Gary L. Smith
George L. Smith
Jerry R. Smith
John H. Smith
Ronald L. Smith
Thomas M. Snowden
Guy C. Spitale
Ernest P. Squarzini
William C. Stanley
James R. Steele
Douglas R. Stenger
Loyd M. Stephens
Rutherford D. Stickell
Allan J. Stinson
John H. Storm
Robert G. Streeter
Richard D. Stromfors
Paul R. Sullivan
Dain F. Sutton
Michael R. Syptak
Joseph J. Tarnowski, Jr.
Joseph G. Tarpley II
David I. Tatman
Donald M. Taylor
Edward W. Taylor
Charles R. Terry
John R. Theorell
John R. Thompson
Neil M. Tobie.
Paul D. Tolleson
Frank M. Townsend, Jr.
John C. Truesdell
Robert J. Tufts
Stephen L. Turner
John J. Veth
Jerry E. Vion
John L. Vitelli
Peter S. Vogt
James L. Von Boeckman
George E. Vranesh
Mark A. Vycital
Richard C. Wagner
Lawrence E. Wagy
Gerald R. Walker
Thomas G. Walker
James A. Wallace, Jr.
Thomas G. Wallace
Gail D. Walston
Joe K. Walters
Verne V. Wattawa
Virgil H. Webb
John G. Weber
Joseph B. Webster III
Charles F. Weitz
Kenneth L. Wells
Walter C. Wells
Robert A. M. White
Ellis H. Whitehead
Jerry F. Whitley
John C. Whitney
Gary M. Wieck
Fred H. Williamson, Jr.
Larry J. Wilson
James M. Wimberly
Jon L. Wingo
James E. Wiseman
Robert A. Wiswell
William L. Withuhn
Sun K. Wong
Ronald L. Woodall
Edward Woods
Fredrick J. Wozniak
Larry D. Zach
Jon A. Zadra
Milan Zimer
Joseph F. Zmuda
Dennis J. Zurbay
Ronald J. Zwolinski

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Henry J. von Schlichten, pastor, Lutheran Church of Our Savior, Port Washington, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Lord bless our Country's President,
Our Halls of Congress, too;
The people on our continent,
The good we try to do.
Lord, keep us in Your loving care,
Unharmed by night and day,
On land and sea and in the air,
At home and far away.

Lord, make Your gracious face to shine
Upon a troubled world,
That needs a spark of light divine
To keep our faith unfurled;
Lord lift Your holy countenance
Upon the ways of men
Who look to You for sustenance,
And grant us peace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 25, 1963, was read and approved.

FREEDOM EXCHANGE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has announced that action will be taken to suspend passport privileges for 58 fellow travelers now in Cuba. This would mean that upon their return to this country, these fellow travelers would be prohibited from further foreign travel. It is to be hoped that the Justice Department is also planning prosecution in this matter to the limit of the law. Such action conforms with our Government's policy aimed at curbing inter-American travel to Cuba.

However, in the light of developments, I would seriously urge that the State Department explore yet another course of action in this matter, one more appropriate in dealing with U.S. citizens who find life in Castro's Cuba so much to their liking that they violate their own country's laws to travel there.

What I propose is that our State Department not only make clear to these 58 fellow travelers that they have the option of remaining in Castro's Cuba, but actively encourage them to do so. If Cuba today is indeed the island paradise for democracy that these 58 have proclaimed in Castro-sponsored propaganda announcements, there is really no reason to anticipate that they would return to the United States.

Let those who would voluntarily remain in Cuba do so, with the blessings of our Government and the American people.

On the other hand, there are other people in Cuba today, under the repressive heel of the Castro regime who despise the Communist tyranny and can appreciate the gift of freedom provided in this country.