

Speaker, accelerates our rate of juvenile delinquency. It would not surprise me one bit to find a direct correlation between this inability to get jobs among young men, on the one hand, and their decision through restlessness to follow a path to young delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will accept the amendment, particularly since the President can negate this action at any time he feels that a reduction in draft age is either impeding voluntary enlistments or there exists a need for larger numbers for military per-

sonnel. We are the only nation in the world that drafts men into the Army at the ripe age of 26; all other nations draft their soldiers at much lower ages. Is it not time we ended this foolishness and folly? I hope we do by adopting my amendment.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1963

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

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

Our Father, God, in this moment of quietness, hushing all discordant noises, that we may hear Thy voice, we would ponder the pattern our lives are weaving, as we bow in Thy searching presence, O God, unto whom all hearts are open, and from whom no desires or secrets are hid.

When in the light of Thy righteousness and truth we examine ourselves, our hearts are filled with regret and discontent, for we confess with sorrow that we have so often missed the shining marks of our high calling which beckon us even from the valley of defeat.

Yet even in all our failure to attain, we are lured by the haunting creed that life is capacity for the excellent. Help us to make it a pursuit of the best, and, casting aside all counsels of despair, to press on with buoyant feet, firm in the faith that for ourselves, our Nation, and our world, the best is yet to be in a golden tomorrow for all mankind.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the following appointments.

To the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy: Senators PASTORE, KEFAUVER, and KEATING.

To the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy: Senators ROBERTSON, BARTLETT, and BEALL.

To the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy: Senators HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, and GOLDWATER.

To the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy: Senator BAYH.

To the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy: Senator DODD.

To the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board: Senators MAGNUSON (4-year term) and PROUTY (2-year term).

To the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission: Senator NEUBERGER.

To the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Senators ERVIN, MUNDT, and MUSKIE.

To the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission: Senators ELLENDER, LONG of Louisiana, COOPER, MORTON, EASTLAND, STENNIS, KEFAUVER, and GORE.

To the Senate Office Building Commission: Senators JORDAN of North Carolina, CANNON, and DIRKSEN.

To the National Memorial Stadium Commission: Senators HARTKE and DOMINICK.

To the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures: Senators LONG of Louisiana, vice Senator Kerr, deceased, and Saltonstall, vice Senator Dirksen, resigned.

To the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission: Senator HRUSKA, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term as Senator of Mr. Capehart.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the

House of Representatives concurring herein). That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the Legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

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

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the Senate, January 29, 1963.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD E. FERRANDES,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives, March 5, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, JR.,

"Speaker of House of Representatives.

"FREDRIC B. SELCKE,

"Clerk of House of Representatives."

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q-1

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

"Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis; and

"Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a

full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

"STANLEY SANGRANT,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"FRANK A. WINSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman announced the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.7 cents per pound. This announcement came as good news to cotton farmers for it means their income will be sustained.

There have been attempts by some who want prices dropped to say that farmers were not pleased with the action holding the support price at this level. Nothing could be further from the truth. Farmers in South Carolina well remember the "sliding down" price-support program under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. They have not forgotten what it did to their income.

Anyone doubting South Carolina's satisfaction with Secretary Freeman's price-support program for cotton should read the senate resolution adopted and approved by the South Carolina Senate March 5 commending Secretary Freeman for his program and clearly pointing out the material importance of this resolution to our State and cotton farmers for whom he has done so much.

Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk this senate resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 190

Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32 and 47 hundredths cent per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10 percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on Middling 1-inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1048. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1049. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1050. A bill to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1051. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Carlo Dimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDIAN HEIRSHIP BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which I am chairman, has been engaged for several years in an

effort to resolve one of the most complex problems in the field of Indian affairs—the multiple ownership of Indian allotments. The Indian heirship land problem arises from the fact that the United States holds in trust for Indians about 41,000 tracts of allotted land—approximately 6 million acres—that are in fractionated ownership. This situation arose when, upon the death of the original allottee, his or her estate was probated and the heirs were given undivided interests in the tract.

Through the years, successive probates have taken place affecting the same tract until at the present time there may be anywhere from 2 to 200 heirs holding fractional interests in the same piece of trust land. This fractionation of ownership has created serious problems for the heirs themselves, the tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has responsibility for managing trust land.

In an effort to learn all the facts relating to the multiple ownership of Indian land, the staffs of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, in conjunction with the specialists of the Library of Congress, made extensive studies of the problem, beginning in 1959. In 1961, two heirship land survey reports were published by the House and Senate. These documents contain the most complete and up-to-date information on what the heirship problems are and where the problems exist. The reports also reflect suggested solutions by Indian owners of these lands, as well as administrators in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Based on the committee studies, I introduced S. 1392 on March 21, 1961, and that bill was used as a vehicle for exploring further the viewpoints and wishes of the people most affected by this problem. Hearings were conducted in August 1961, and valuable testimony was received from Members of the Senate and House, the Interior Department, the Justice Department, the General Accounting Office, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes.

At the completion of the hearings there was a mass of materials, suggestions, and recommendations. I instructed the staff to study the hearings thoroughly and re-draft the bill or amendments thereto based on the excellent material then available. Unfortunately, due to the excessive congressional workload, there was no opportunity for further hearings on proposed amendments.

In February 1962, I introduced a second bill, S. 2899, relating to the Indian heirship land problem. The provisions of S. 2899 included many of the recommendations that had been made to the committee during the hearing in the preceding year on S. 1392. Again extensive hearings were held and published and widely distributed to Indian tribes and others concerned with the problem. Since the close of hearings on S. 2899 the staff has been busy consulting with the various Indian organizations, tribal representatives, and Federal agencies over changes that would make the bill more effective and acceptable.

The recommendations and suggestions made during and after the hearings have

been sifted and analyzed at great length, and the bill that I am sponsoring today is the product of many months and years of investigation into the extent of heirship and the solutions needed to resolve this most difficult problem in the administration of Indian affairs. Every effort has been made in drafting the bill to authorize and implement an effective program to alleviate the heirship problem. Particular attention has been given in designing a bill to maximize the opportunity to return multiple-owned land to individual Indian ownership or to tribal ownership and to preserve its trust status.

The language of this new measure gives the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude to solve the problem but allows him enough discretion to protect the best interests of the Indian owners. The most controversial sections of the earlier bills have been modified or eliminated completely, but the Secretary is still provided the necessary tools to relieve what has been a worsening problem, one that has adversely affected many Indian owners of allotted lands.

Mr. President, our committee has had two complete hearings on two separate bills, and they have been so productive I want to have additional comment and suggestions, not only from the executive departments but from representatives of Indian tribal organizations and the tribes themselves. It is my intention to schedule hearings at an early date, and I feel certain that, with the cooperation of all of those who have a vital interest in this matter, we will be able to report corrective legislation to the Senate early in this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I am introducing today may be printed in full following these brief remarks and that a section-by-section analysis of the bill, as prepared by the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, may also be included in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1049) relating to the Indian heirship land problem, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, 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 (a) the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in any land, where ten or fewer persons own undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in any land where eleven or more persons own undivided interests, where all of the undivided interests are in a trust or restricted status, may request the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), and the Secretary is hereby authorized to partition the land in kind, or to partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or to sell the land if partition is not practicable and a sale would be in the best interest of the Indian owners.

(b) When any of the undivided interests in a tract of land is in an unrestricted status, the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where ten or fewer persons own such undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where eleven or more persons own such undivided interests, may request the Secretary, and the Secretary is hereby authorized, to sell all trust or restricted interests if a sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners. The Secretary may also partition the land in kind, partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or sell all interests if authorized to partition or sell the unrestricted interests by a power of attorney from the owner of the unrestricted interests.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Secretary, after receiving a request to partition or sell any tract of land under subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act, is unable after due effort to obtain the approval of an unrestricted interest in such tract, he shall, upon application of the persons making the foregoing request, consent to judicial partition or sale of such tract if in his judgment such action is in the best interests of the Indian owners. Where such consent is granted, jurisdiction over the land is hereby conferred on any State court of competent jurisdiction to hear and determine the partition or sale proceedings and to render judgment for partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with the law of the State wherein the lands are situated. The United States shall be an indispensable party to any such proceeding with the right of removal of the cause to the United States district court for the district in which the land is located, following the procedure in title 28, United States Code, section 1446. The proceeds of sale of the trust or restricted interests shall be paid to the Secretary for distribution unless he waives this requirement as to any of the owners thereof. If the land so partitioned or sold is acquired by an individual Indian or an Indian tribe, title thereto shall be taken in the manner prescribed in subsection 5(d) of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) If, with respect to any land transferred pursuant to this Act there is in existence an exemption from taxation which constitutes a vested property right, such exemption shall continue in force and effect until it terminates by virtue of its own limitations.

(b) Any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that is reserved to an Indian owner in any sale of land made pursuant to this Act shall be reserved in a trust status. No sale made under this Act shall include any mineral estate that has been reserved to any Indian tribe by any provision of law.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who is non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall give actual notice or notice by publication and provide an opportunity for a hearing before partitioning in kind or selling land pursuant to this Act. All sales of lands made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Upon receipt of requests from the required ownership interests, the Secretary shall notify the tribe and each owner of an undivided Indian interest in the land by a letter directed to his last known address that each such owner and the tribe has a right to purchase the land for its appraised value, unless one of the owners or his au-

thorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary, or for a lower price if all of the owners agree, and that if more than one owner or if one owner and the tribe wants to purchase the land it will be sold on the basis of sealed competitive bids restricted to the owners of undivided interests in the land and the tribe unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary.

(b) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a competitive sale restricted to the owners of undivided interests and the tribe, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right in the tribe or any Indian owner to meet the high bid, unless one of the Indian owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary. All bids shall be rejected if no bid substantially equal to the appraised value is received.

(c) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right to meet the high bid, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed bids: *Provided*, That, after notice to all interested parties including the tribe, the land shall be sold at auction immediately after the opening of the sealed bids, and auction bidding shall be limited to the Indian owners, the tribe, and persons who submitted sealed bids in amounts not less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land. The highest sealed bid shall be considered the opening auction bid. No sale shall be made unless the price is equal to the highest sealed bid and substantially equal to the appraised value: *And provided further*, That the term "appraised value" as used in this section shall mean the current appraised value of the land, said appraisal to be not more than one year old.

(d) Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian pursuant to this Act shall be taken in trust unless the land is located outside the boundaries of the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area. Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian that is outside the boundaries of the reservation and approved consolidation area shall be taken in the name of the purchaser without any restriction on alienation, control, or use.

SEC. 6. (a) In order to assist tribes that wish to purchase land offered for sale under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a loan to any tribe under the conditions stated below, provided the tribe does not have funds available in an amount that is adequate to make the purchase and is unable to obtain a loan from any other source. Such loans shall be made from the revolving funds referred to in section 10 of this Act.

(b) The amount of the loan shall not exceed the appraised value of the land plus the value of any other property the tribe may mortgage or pledge as security for the loan.

(c) The tribe shall give to the United States a mortgage on the land purchased by the tribe with the loan, and on any other tribal property which the Secretary deems necessary to adequately secure the loan.

(d) A loan shall be for a term of not to exceed thirty years, and shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary. A loan need not require repayment in equal installments, but it shall require repayment according to a schedule that will fully amortize the loan within the time specified. In the event of a default in the repayment of the loan, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such action as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. If during the period of repayment the tribe is awarded a money judgment against the United States, and if the payment of any in-

stallment on the loan is in default, the installment(s) in default shall be collected from the appropriation to satisfy the judgment insofar as the amount of the appropriation will cover the same.

(e) Before a loan is made under this Act the tribe shall submit for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior a master plan for the use of all lands to be purchased. No plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless it has been first considered at a general meeting of tribal members called for that purpose, upon due notice to all adult members of the tribe, and approved by a majority of the adult members present and voting at that meeting. Any tribe preparing a plan may call upon the Secretary for technical assistance, and the Secretary shall render such assistance as may be necessary. Such plan shall include provisions for consolidation of holdings of the tribe, or acquisition of sufficient lands in conjunction with those held to permit reasonable economic utilization of the land and repayment of the loan. Such plan may be revised from time to time with the approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 7. Any tribe that adopts with the approval of the Secretary a plan pursuant to subsection 6(e) of this Act, or any other plan that does not involve a loan from the United States but which provides for the consolidation, management, use, or disposition of tribal land, is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property in furtherance of such plan.

Sec. 8. The Secretary shall approve no plan pursuant to this Act that contains any provision that will prohibit or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities with respect to the land during the term of the plan.

Sec. 9. This Act shall not repeal any authority of the Secretary under other law, but it shall supersede any limitation on the authority of the Secretary that is inconsistent with this Act.

Sec. 10. (a) All funds that are now or hereafter a part of the revolving fund authorized by the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968), and the Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44), as amended and supplemented, including sums received in settlement of debts of livestock pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 190), sums collected in repayment of loans heretofore or hereafter made, shall hereafter be available for loans to organizations of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts (hereinafter referred to as Indians), having a form of organization that is satisfactory to the Secretary, and to individual Indians of one-quarter degree or more of Indian blood who are not members of or eligible for membership in an organization that is making loans to its members, for any purpose that will promote the economic development of such organizations and their members, or the individual Indian borrowers.

(b) The appropriation authorization in section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended by the Act of September 15, 1961 (75 Stat. 520), is hereby amended by increasing it from \$20,000,000 to \$55,000,000.

Sec. 11. The Secretary is authorized to execute such patents, deeds, orders, or other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 12. The terms "owner" and "owners" as used herein include, wherever applicable, any tribe, band, group community, or pueblo of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts, and also include any federally chartered organizations of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts.

Sec. 13. (a) Sections 1 through 9 of this Act shall become effective one year after the date of its enactment.

(b) The Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify by publication Indian tribes and owners of undivided interests in Indian trust or restricted land, of the rights of such tribe or owners, under this Act.

Sec. 14. (a) The Secretary shall, prior to the conclusion of any probate proceeding conducted on or after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify each heir or devisee having an interest in such proceedings of his rights under this Act.

(b) Beginning one year after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress setting forth the progress made in the preceding year in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. CHURCH is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 1049 SECTION BY SECTION

Section 1(a): This section applies only to that heirship land where all the undivided interests are in trust status, and subdivides that land into two categories. The first category would be tracts owned by up to 10 heirs and the second, tracts owned by 11 or more. Where there are up to 10 owners any 1 or more owning a 50 percent or larger interest may request the Secretary of the Interior to sell or partition the land. In those tracts where there are 11 or more owners the requirement is reduced to 1 or more owning at least 25 percent of the land. The Secretary is authorized to partition the entire tract, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or if this is not practicable he may sell the entire tract if the sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners.

Section 1(b): This subsection applies to those tracts of land where there are interests in nontrust status. Generally this means that a non-Indian has inherited a share in the estate. The same categories are present as in (a) with a 50-percent minimum ownership required for authority to request partition or sale in tracts with up to 10 owners and a minimum of 25 percent in tracts with 11 or more owners. The Secretary may sell the trust or restricted interests and may, with the approval of nontrust owners, partition all of the land, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or sell the entire tract.

Section 2: If the Secretary is unable to obtain the approval of owners with unrestricted interests to sell or partition the land he may, upon request, transfer jurisdiction to State courts for judgment to partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with State law. The United States reserves the right of removal to the U.S. district court. Title to any land partitioned or sold that is acquired by an Indian or tribe shall be taken in trust under certain conditions (see 5(d)).

Section 3(a): Some questions in the past have been raised concerning whether tax exemption of Indian properties is a vested property right. This section is designed to protect such rights, if they exist.

Section 3(b): Provides that any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that are reserved shall be held in trust, and tribal mineral interests will not be affected under this act.

Section 4: The Secretary is authorized to act for Indian owners who cannot act for themselves.

Section 5: Provides that notice by publication must be made and the interested parties provided a hearing before action is taken under this act. Procedures to carry out sale or partition are stated as follows: (a) When a request to sell or partition has been received each owner and the tribe is notified. Each is allowed to purchase the land at appraised or lower value unless one owner objects. If more than one is interested there will be sealed bids among them.

(b) If action in (a) is objected to there shall be sealed competitive bids with right of tribe or owner to meet the high bid, unless there is objection. All bids will be rejected if no bid is substantially equal to the appraised value. (c) If there is objection to (b) the land shall be offered for sale by sealed competitive bids, and after notice to all parties including the tribe, it will be sold at auction. Auction is limited to owners, tribe, and those bidding more than 75 percent of appraised value. Highest sealed bid is the opening auction bid. Sale price must be substantially equal to current appraised value. (d) Land acquired by Indians or tribes under these procedures will be taken in trust if within the reservation and tribal consolidation areas.

Section 6(a): If a tribe does not have money to purchase such lands they can borrow it from the Government under certain conditions. The Government shall be given security, hold a mortgage on the land and other property. Maximum loan for 30 years with interest set by Secretary. If the tribe receives a judgment any payments in default shall be collected therefrom. A master plan for land consolidation shall be drafted by the tribe and approved by the adult membership before presentation to the Secretary. The Secretary shall render technical assistance in preparing a plan if requested.

Section 7: Any consolidation plan involving a Federal loan or not will carry with it approval to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property to carry out the purposes of the plan.

Section 8: In an effort to avoid any programs that might tend to confuse any termination activities, no plan can be approved that will prevent or delay such actions.

Section 9: The purpose of this act is to add to the Secretary's powers and shall not repeal any present authority.

Section 10: All funds presently authorized for loans to Indians would be consolidated into one revolving fund. This is in keeping with a recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee. An additional \$35 million is authorized for loans, making a total of more than \$55 million in authorizations for this purpose and other requirements.

Section 11: Provides general authority for the Secretary to execute all necessary documents to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 12: Definition of the terms "owner" and "owners" as used in the bill.

Section 13(a): A delay of 1 year is provided during which time the Secretary can notify the tribes and they can plan their programs. This period can also be utilized by the Department to formulate necessary regulations, etc., to implement the program.

Section 13(b): The Secretary is to notify by publication heirship landowners and the tribes of their rights under this act.

Section 14(a): At all probate hearings after 1 year the Secretary shall notify each interested party of their rights.

Section 14(b): Provides that the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress on the workings of this act.

NORTHWEST LUMBER PRODUCTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one day early next week a cargo vessel will dock at the port of San Juan, P.R., to discharge 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber—1,400,000 feet of lumber from Oregon forests, cruised, logged, hauled, sawed, and loaded by Oregon workers.

This event would have been of little note a decade ago when Oregon and Washington forests supplied the entire

Puerto Rican need for Northwest softwood. Yet this vessel will be delivering the first shipload of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico in more than 2 years.

What had happened to this traditional U.S. market? The answer is not obscure. Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, the Jones Act, decrees that domestic vessels shall enjoy a monopoly in the transportation of goods from one American port to another. Because of these restrictions, the American lumber producer was forced to pay freight charges as much as \$30 per 1,000 board feet greater than his competitors, the lumber producers of neighboring British Columbia, who were free to ship in the world market for steamship charters.

The Jones Act was designed to nurture and protect the domestic coastal shipping trade. During the first half of the century the protection which it furnished was both meaningful and adequate; but changing patterns of commerce transformed the Jones Act into an instrument of destruction, not only of domestic industries such as the lumber industry, but of segments of the shipping industry itself.

Despite the supposed protection of the Jones Act, domestic shipping has suffered a steady and relentless decline from its postwar highs. As late as 1955, 101 ships and 4,300 men were employed in the intercoastal trade. There are today not more than 22 vessels exclusively devoted to intercoastal shipping, employing less than 1,000 men. There are today no common carriers left to serve Northwest lumber shippers, although two private lines offer, from time to time, space to lumber producers. This month neither line had space to offer.

The shipload of lumber which arrives in Puerto Rico next week owes its very existence to the adoption by the last Congress of an amendment which I offered to permit the suspension of Jones Act restrictions on lumber shipments to Puerto Rico. The Maritime Administrator, charged with the implementation of this amendment, made the following crucial finding in granting the first of several suspensions under the terms of the amendment:

We have here two segments of American enterprise both of which are sorely beset by foreign competition. The record of this proceeding shows that under the preexisting legislation banning the use of foreign-flag vessels in domestic shipping, no lumber from the Pacific Northwest has moved to Puerto Rico during the last 2 years, due in some part to the lower foreign-flag transportation rates which have assisted Canadian producers in capturing this formerly American-held market. Thus, the Congress decided to lift the ban under certain conditions in order to relieve the distress of at least the lumber industry. To have continued the prohibition would have had the effect of perpetuating the depression in both industries.

By next month, Mr. President, sales of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico will have exceeded 7 million board feet—sales translated concretely into jobs for northwest lumber and sawmill workers.

But we cannot afford to stop with Puerto Rico. The distress—and there is deep distress—in the coastal lumber

mill towns of Oregon and Washington arises primarily from the loss of traditional Atlantic coast markets to Canadian lumber producers. Last year British Columbia sawmills shipped 875 million board feet of lumber to the east coast, while Washington and Oregon producers shipped only 524 million board feet. The Canadians have thus gobbled up nearly two-thirds of the Atlantic coast market, though as recently as 1951 the Canadians' share of this stable market was a bare 7 percent.

Last week, I received from a Vancouver, British Columbia, newspaper a clipping heralding the sailing of a vessel laden with the largest single lumber cargo in history—more than 11 million board feet of packaged lumber "all consigned to U.S. Atlantic coast ports." One day later, I received the following grim telegram from Newport, Oreg.:

Just received report on lumber shipment by water for month of January. Our mill is 90-percent water shipment to east coast market. Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau report shows British Columbia shipped east coast 90,252,829 board feet; total U.S. shipments 26,751,307 board feet. British Columbia shipped approximately 75 percent of all lumber going to east coast market. We need help.

L. H. ANDERSON,
President, Lincoln Lumber Sales, Inc.

Between 1947 and 1962, employment in Oregon sawmills and planing mills alone dwindled from 45,000 to 28,000.

Was the Jones Act the culprit? The State Department, in a report prepared last year for western Senators, thought so:

There is no question but that the 600 million board feet of lumber which moved by water from the U.S. Pacific Northwest in 1961 to the east coast was at a serious competitive disadvantage with respect to waterborne shipments from British Columbia as a result of higher transportation costs. The average margin of difference in 1961 is reported to have been on the order of \$10 per thousand board feet for shipments to the Atlantic seaboard. Data are not available on comparative costs for shipments to southern California and Hawaii, but the margin of difference was probably proportionate. In the case of shipments to Puerto Rico, where Canadian lumber has also made inroads in 1960 and 1961, the difference is reported to have been about \$26 per thousand board feet.

During the past 5 years, there has been a decline amounting to 400 million board feet per year in the level of waterborne shipments from the U.S. Pacific coast mills and a corresponding increase in the level of waterborne shipments from British Columbia mills. While other factors may have contributed to the shift, it appears that the substantial difference in freight costs has been principally responsible. There is no reason to believe that the trend will be reversed so long as the cost difference prevails.

The Commerce Department made a similar finding; and, several weeks ago, the Tariff Commission refused to find that concessions granted under trade agreements were a principal cause of the woes of the domestic lumber industry, although the Commission did find that the trend of imports of softwood lumber is upward:

Although imports of softwood lumber by water currently account for only about one-

fourth of the total imports of such lumber, the very large and rising disparity in cargo rates favorable to imports by water has obviously contributed much more to the recent increase in imports of softwood lumber than has the aggregate of the trade-agreement concessions applicable thereto.

President Kennedy has acknowledged the need for Jones Act reform, in order to alleviate the hardship of the Northwest lumber industry. Last July, the President called for amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws to permit use of foreign vessels when those conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. This amendment will reduce the handicaps suffered by American producers in the intercoastal shipment of lumber.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I again introduce proposed legislation to suspend the provisions of the Jones Act. As I have often said in the past, I have no desire to damage what is left of the coastal shipping trade. I deeply regret that even a handful of seamen may be displaced by Jones Act reform; but I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that the nearly 1 billion board feet of lumber shipped by Canadian watermills into our markets means the loss of at least 7,000 prime jobs for Northwest workers and support for their families and the services and trades that depend upon prime payrolls. Problems of the domestic merchant marine will not be solved by continuing conditions that put lumber and sawmill workers on the unemployment rolls.

The action of the northwest lumbermen in boldly reentering the Puerto Rican market immediately upon the lifting of the Jones Act restrictions proved beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jones Act was the crucial anticompetitive factor excluding northwest lumber from its traditional market. West coast lumbermen have shown that when they are given a chance to compete upon a basis of equality, they need no subsidy. This is demonstrably true of the Puerto Rico market. It is no less true of the Atlantic coast market and other domestic markets.

The bill which I now introduce and send to the desk represents as narrow an inroad upon the Jones Act restrictions as I could devise and still provide meaningful relief to the lumber industry. Surely Wesley Jones, for many years a distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, little dreamed that the lumber industry of his own State and of neighboring States would be crippled by the act which bears his name.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with various newspaper articles and editorials, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that the bill be held at the desk for 3 days, in order to provide an opportunity for other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

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

The bill (S. 1050) to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, 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 first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes", approved October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking out all through "the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "The provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), shall be suspended with respect to the transportation of lumber between any ports or terminal areas".

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act of October 24, 1962, is amended by striking out "or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs".

The articles and editorials presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER are as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 20, 1962]

NORTHWEST ONCE SUPPLIED ALL OF PUERTO RICO'S LUMBER

The Puerto Rican lumber market, which Oregon and Washington lumber shippers hope to reenter by means of foreign-flag ships, was entirely a U.S. market until 1950 when British Columbia began shipping to that island country, according to records of the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau.

The bureau's reports show that Oregon and Washington lumbermen had Puerto Rico to themselves, as far as the fir region was concerned until 13 years ago. Between 1934 and 1949, west coast shipments to Puerto Rico ranged up to 21,800,000 board feet a year except during the war years of 1943 and 1944 when no shipments were recorded.

Before World War II, Oregon and Washington loaded an average of 14,500,000 board feet a year for Puerto Rico.

Then in 1950, the PLIB reports show, British Columbia stepped in with shipments of 7,700,000 board feet to Puerto Rico while Oregon and Washington were shipping 17,300,000 board feet. The British Columbia movement dropped back to 1,200,000 board feet in 1961 but stepped up to 8,100,000 board feet in 1962 and have increased rapidly every year since.

SHIPMENTS DIP

Meanwhile, Oregon and Washington shipments gained to 22,300,000 board feet in 1953, and dropped off rapidly from that point to 1961 when no lumber went from the west coast States.

British Columbia increased its shipments to Puerto Rico to 42 million feet by 1956, to 62,800,000 by 1959, and hit 73 million board feet in 1961, the year the west coast States bowed out entirely.

During the first 10 months of 1962, British Columbia shipped 65,400,000 board feet to Puerto Rico, an average of 6,500,000 feet a month. At this rate, British Columbia may hit 78 million board feet, a new annual record, this year.

FIRMS SEEK OK

Oregon and Washington lumber firms are seeking authority from the U.S. Maritime Administration to use foreign-flag ships to haul their lumber to Puerto Rico, and one of them, Georgia-Pacific Co., has been given authority to do so, but only after U.S. flag operators have been allowed 5 days in which to match foreign-flag shipping rates.

The authority was granted by invoking provisions of the Neuberger amendment to the Jones Act which confines shipping between American ports to American bottoms.

Several other firms have applied for similar authority and were heard by a Maritime Administration examiner last week.

The lumbermen have objected to any waiting time in favor of U.S. ships because they claim they cannot hold space in foreign vessels while American owners are making up their minds.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 4, 1963]

CANADIAN LUMBER PRODUCERS REBOUND WITH INCREASED SHIPMENTS TO UNITED STATES

Canadian lumber producers, who eased up on their recordbreaking shipments into the United States, while the American Tariff Commission was considering putting a brake on imports, are back strong as ever, according to Canadian and American reports.

Evidence of the stepped-up shipments to the United States appeared in Vancouver, British Columbia, this past week where lumber shippers loaded the all-time record single shipment of 11.2 million feet net, aboard the Greek ship *Paros* for the U.S. east coast market.

The new record broke a record established only a short time earlier by a sister ship, the *Signos*, also loaded with Canadian lumber.

TRUTH BROUGHT HOME

The truth of the shipping handicap facing American lumber shippers was brought home clearly by the two record loads. The Canadian mills were able to hire these vessels at rates approximately \$14 a thousand below the cheapest rates offered the American mills.

Under the Jones Act, American shippers must use only American vessels and the rates on the American vessels are \$10 to \$14 a thousand higher than on the foreign vessels used by Canadians in capturing the market.

The big push on the Canadian shipments was also pointed up in Crow's Weekly Lumber Letter this past week where the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau figures showed the Canadians shipped 90.2 million feet to the U.S. east coast in January. The American mills shipped only 25.7 million feet in the same period.

Compounding the rate differential facing the American mills was the fact that the only two U.S. lines hauling lumber cargoes intercoastal, Calmar and Weyerhaeuser, were not offering space for shipment next month.

Weyerhaeuser hauls its own lumber cargoes and does not always have space for other shippers. Calmar is a line owned by Bethlehem Steel and is used primarily for hauling steel products westward.

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, with her amendment to the Jones Act, opened up Puerto Rico to foreign vessels carrying U.S. lumber earlier this year and already several loads of U.S. lumber have gone into that market, the first shipments from the U.S. mills in several years.

Now Mrs. NEUBERGER is planning to reintroduce a bill for the elimination of the Jones Act, a move recommended by President Kennedy and a move the American lumber shippers say they must have if they are to continue in competition with the Canadian imports.

[From the Daily Astorian, June 22, 1962]

SOMETHING ELSE IS NEEDED

Maritime interests have protested repeal of the Jones Act as a relief measure for distressed Northwest lumbermen.

This illustrates the almost inevitable fact that adjustment of governmental economic controls to benefit one segment of the economy will cause distress to some other

segment, and that some compensating adjustment must be made. Which of course can lead to distress and readjustment in still a third segment, and so on.

A Government-controlled economy is full of headaches, inequities, adjustments, and readjustments.

The purpose of the Jones Act, which requires cargoes from one U.S. port to another to be carried in U.S. ships, is to keep our merchant marine alive. It just barely achieves that purpose, since foreign competition has virtually driven the U.S. merchant marine out of the offshore trade.

Lumbermen suffer under the Jones Act, which virtually requires them, as well as other coastwise or intercoastal shippers, to subsidize the merchant marine.

But obviously repeal of the act will almost put the U.S. merchant marine completely out of business, unless some compensating form of subsidy is provided.

No one wants the U.S. merchant marine eliminated. Its existence is considered essential to the national defense.

Since it cannot compete economically with foreign ships, and since it is manifestly unfair to have U.S. shippers subsidize it as they do now under the Jones Act, the only alternative seems to be repeal of the Jones Act and substitution of some form of subsidy that will enable U.S. ships to offer freight rates competitive with those of foreign ships.

[From the Oregon Statesman, July 25, 1962]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has proposed what seems to be the most practical method of providing through Government some aid to the distressed lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest. She introduced a bill which would lift the bar in the Jones Act which prevents foreign-flag vessels from engaging in carrying freight or passengers between U.S. ports. Applied to lumber shipping this would mean that U.S. mills could compete even stephen with Canadian mills as far as freight costs to the Atlantic coast are concerned.

Senator MAGNUSON would let the bar stand but would offset it by a subsidy from the Treasury to equalize shipping costs. Since he is chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce where the matter is under consideration, it is probable that his approach will be preferred over that of Senator NEUBERGER. It is not, in my opinion, as satisfactory a method of helping the lumber industry, and has slim chance of adoption.

This provision of the Jones Act is a form of protection to domestic shipping and to seamen. But it imposes a considerable cost on domestic shippers. Repeal of the provision would make for open competition both in shipping and in the lumber business.

In her statement before the Commerce Committee Senator NEUBERGER listed the following as points agreed on:

1. A significant segment of the lumber industry is depressed.

2. A major cause has been the loss of the Atlantic coast market to Canadian producers.

3. The Jones Act gives Canadian lumber producers a substantial cost advantage in competing for this market.

4. Despite the protection offered by the Jones Act intercoastal shipping has been in progressive decline.

As to the invasion of the U.S. market Mrs. NEUBERGER stated that British Columbia mills' share of the Atlantic coast market for waterborne shipments of Douglas fir and hemlock had increased from 7 percent in 1951 to 57 percent in 1961 and 72 percent in June 1962. Canadian shippers, free to use ocean tramp steamers, are able to lay down their lumber on the east coast at \$13 below the American conference rate.

The argument for subsidizing our merchant marine is to have merchant vessels available

in event of war. But, as the junior Senator from Oregon stated, only 22 vessels are exclusively engaged in the intercoastal trade. Of these, 20 are Liberty ships of World War II vintage, of which we have many in the "water bank."

The protective feature of the Jones Act hasn't maintained intercoastal shipping. The once big steamship lines like Luckenbach and American-Hawaiian have quit running from coast to coast. Mrs. NEUBERGER thinks the Jones Act has hurt rather than helped this shipping. She expressed the view that under the spur of foreign competition American operators may exercise American ingenuity and be able to compete.

It does seem absurd to retain a provision which hasn't worked. And it seems eminently sensible to drop it since it would provide virtually immediate benefit to U.S. lumber producers without making any draft on the Treasury.

[From the Walla Walla Union Bulletin, Jan. 1, 1963]

PRICED OFF THE SEAS

Even with Federal subsidies, few U.S. maritime concerns are in a competitive position with carriers under other flags and the situation reacted, in recent months, to the disadvantage of lumbering, one of the principal industries of the Pacific Northwest.

When Canada devalued its dollar and, with more favorable freight rates, was able to lay down lumber in the east and south of this country at prices substantially below those the mills of the Pacific Northwest could afford, petitions for modifying the Jones Act were filed with the Maritime Commission. Relief was granted, in part, when the Commission gave permission for U.S. lumber to move to Puerto Rico, a U.S. possession, in foreign ships.

In the next few weeks, as a result of that step, the first American lumber cargo in 43 years to go to an American port in a foreign ship will load 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber at Coos Bay to go to San Juan, P.R.

Before negotiations were closed with a Japanese line, opportunity was required to be given owners of U.S. vessels to compete for the business. The best offer, so Georgia-Pacific, the shipper, reported, was about \$17 per thousand above the winning bid. Lower ship costs and lower operating expenses of foreign vessels are factors that U.S. shipping cannot meet.

The 1920 Merchant Marine Act was written to preserve the American merchant marine coastal fleet for times of national emergency. What once was a sizable fleet now is down to about a dozen vessels, employing fewer than 500 seamen. The men who sail our vessels are the best paid of any in the world, but foreign aid by this country has at the same time helped some of our allies to modernize their merchant marine and, operating at wage scales far below those applying here, they have gained competitive advantage that, as with lumbering, has adversely affected the U.S. economy.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1962]

TRADE RESTRICTIONS

The current difficulties of the softwood industry in the Pacific Northwest provide a graphic illustration of how an ancient restrictive practice can threaten the welfare of a large number of people and hamper the Government's efforts to expand international trade.

As recently as 1959 more than 60 percent of the lumber shipped, largely by water, to the Atlantic coast came from the States of the Pacific Northwest with British Columbia supplying most of the balance. Since then the shares have been reversed. At stake is the production of about a half billion

board feet of American lumber and the loss of more than 3,000 jobs.

The difficulties of the softwood industry are attributable to three factors: the devaluation of the Canadian dollar which works to the advantage of the British Columbia lumbermen; the slightly more favorable terms on which the Canadians can purchase Government-owned timber; and the shipping cost advantage which the Canadians enjoy.

According to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, known as the Jones Act, all cargoes shipped between Pacific and Atlantic coast ports must be carried in American-flag vessels. This ancient practice of "cabotage," or reserving the coastal trade to American vessels, originated in the reign of Edward III of England (1327-77). The British have wisely abandoned this practice long ago, but laws barring the use of foreign vessels in the American coastal trade have been in force since 1808. As a consequence, the American softwood producers must pay about \$36 per thousand board feet on shipments between the Columbia River ports and Brooklyn while the Canadians, who are permitted to charter ships in the highly competitive world market, can ship at rates ranging from \$4 to \$11.

Clearly this is a case in which the welfare of the many is being sacrificed in order to protect the interests of the few. There are now only 13 American-flag vessels on the coastal lumber run which employ a total of 455 men. Thus 455 jobs in the maritime industry are protected at the cost of more than 3,000 jobs in the softwood industry.

We hope the current efforts to repeal or modify the restrictive provisions of the Jones Act will succeed and that the recent appeals to establish a temporary import quota for Canadian softwood will be rejected. The erection of another trade barrier can only work to the disadvantage of both the American and Canadian economies, for such an act would surely touch off a series of retaliations. The public interest will be better served by permitting the Northwest softwood producers to compete on a more equal footing.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1962]

EQUALIZING COMPETITION

As recently as 1957 the lumber producers of Oregon and Washington supplied 77 percent of the waterborne lumber needs of the east coast. By April of this year they had lost all but 28 percent of the monthly total to Canadian suppliers. The loss has cost the west coast industry some 3,500 jobs. It is not surprising that the administration has come under increasing pressure to equalize the competitive position of the American firms.

The advantage has swung to British Columbia lumber operators for a variety of reasons, as the extensive hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee have brought out. They can ship more cheaply by water. Their new money-exchange rate favors them in the U.S. market. Their wage costs are lower, and so are the prices they pay for timber. Of these, Senator NEUBERGER of Oregon, thinks the most important is the fact that the Canadians are free to use the chartered ships of any nation, while the west coast producers are bound by the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 which require the use of the American merchant fleet in shipment of cargoes between American ports. The difference in charter costs, according to Mrs. NEUBERGER, ranges from \$4 to \$11 per thousand board feet on lumber. Accordingly, she wants Congress to repeal the 1920 provision—an action which she contends would do no real harm to the maritime industry since the use of lumber ships in intercoastal trade already has

dwindled in size from 12 shipping lines at the end of World War II to only 3 lines today, utilizing 13 ships and employing only 455 men.

Whether this proposal would provide sufficient relief to justify the action is a matter for the administration and for Congress to determine. For it is not at all likely that this alone would solve the problem completely. But it deserves consideration, along with any other means of easing the setback suffered by the west coast firms. There is no apparent sentiment, and understandably so, to impose quotas on Canadian lumber. In pursuing the worthy goal of expanded international trade, however, the administration has the obligation to find means wherever possible to sustain the competitive position of our own industries.

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 6, 1962]

ONE STEP FORWARD

The quick favorable ruling by Maritime Examiner Paul N. Pfeiffer on the Georgia-Pacific Corp.'s application for permission to use foreign shipping in moving lumber from the Pacific Northwest to Puerto Rico may be an indication that the Kennedy administration is prepared at last to help the Northwest's lumber industry meet severe competition from Canada.

The examiner's ruling must be approved by the Maritime Commissioner and the Secretary of Commerce, but lumber shippers here appear confident that approval will come quickly.

If Northwest lumber shippers take advantage of this first dent in the Jones Act to recapture the 73 million board foot Puerto Rico market from Canada, their case for exemption from the restrictive maritime laws in the Atlantic coast trade will be strengthened. In the recent session of Congress, the Senate Commerce Committee reported favorably on a bill permitting use of foreign ships in the intercoastal trade, but the bill did not come up for passage. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER managed, however, to obtain an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act permitting the use of such ships in moving lumber to Puerto Rico. It was under this amendment that the Georgia-Pacific application was made.

Other firms have made similar applications and presumably will receive equal opportunities. Mr. Pfeiffer's decision, if approved, will permit a shipper to obtain a firm offer from a foreign line at a stated shipping rate. If American-flag lines cannot or will not meet that rate in 3 days, he will be free to use the foreign vessel.

Puerto Rico, of course, is a small part of the world and domestic market for lumber, though an important one. There are other vital factors in the Pacific Northwest's present inability to compete favorably with Canada in these markets. Among them are stumpage costs and procedures for buying Government timber, which U.S. lumbermen contend place them at a serious disadvantage.

Higher loading costs in the United States also affect the total expense of shipping lumber, though some Northwest lumber producers assert this could largely be overcome by construction of specialized carriers. Foreign shipowners appear more ready to build or convert vessels specifically for lumber and log carrying than are the American owners who have a protective umbrella in the form of the Jones Act and subsidies in the offshore trades.

The cheaper Canadian dollar is another factor.

The ruling on the Puerto Rico shipments, if approved, will not solve the problems of Northwest lumbermen. But it is a step which could lead to removal of other Government-imposed restrictions that hamper

this region's free competition in marketing its basic product. Pressure cannot be reduced until the industry is completely unshackled.

[From the Crow's Lumber Digest, Dec. 20, 1962]

THE BREAK IN THE DIKE

The announcement on December 14 that Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges had approved the first application under the Neuberger amendment for usage of foreign vessels in the Puerto Rican trade comes as a pleasant surprise to the industry. Even though the Secretary attached a rather sticky requirement to the permit (giving U.S. lines 5 days to match the freight rate quoted by the foreign shipowners), this action must still be regarded as a break in the dike which has been built up around U.S. cargo-shipping mills.

Puerto Rico is a U.S. possession, yet due to antiquated shipping laws the American mills slowly lost 100 percent of this market over the past 10 years. That country will take 70 to 80 million feet of lumber this year, all from Canada. Now, following months of controversy, U.S. mills have a chance to get back a little of this business.

The Puerto Rican market, however, is a drop in the bucket compared to the volume lost in the U.S. east coast market over the same period of time. In the year of 1952, the U.S. east coast took 1.275 billion feet of lumber by cargo shipment, with 1.053 billion coming from U.S. mills and the remaining 222,000 coming from Canada. In the present year, the east coast market will take approximately 1.400 billion (based on figures available for the first 10 months), and the U.S. mills will have supplied only 500,000 feet. Net loss to the U.S. mills: 500,000 feet per year. Net gain to the Canadian mills: nearly 700,000 feet per year.

This huge loss of east coast volume, coupled with the small victory on the Puerto Rican case, should give the U.S. lumber industry the needed incentive to fight for complete removal of the Jones Act restrictions as they apply to lumber. During the past year, this fight was carried on by relatively few people, with the majority of the industry taking a disinterested viewpoint. Yet all of the industry is affected, since lumber displaced on the east coast eventually seeks other markets, and the entire lumber community is forced to readjust. In many cases, this readjustment is fatal to the mills and wholesalers involved.

The hemlock, which was displaced from the east coast cargo market, found new outlets in the Midwest and in the South, very often at the expense of other established species. This big change seriously affected the price structure on all dimension items including those in the Western pine and Southern pine regions. The Douglas-fir displaced from the east coast has moved in heavier volume to California, disrupting the traditional suppliers to that important market.

The Jones Act, as we see it, is everybody's business. The removal of this restriction could, in due time, gain back some of the 500 million feet per year lost in the east coast markets. We fail to believe that there is any serious shortage of timber in the U.S. producing region, or that American lumber is inferior to Canadian stock as was reported by some eastern distributors at the Tariff Commission hearings. The simple fact remains that our mills are at a huge freight rate disadvantage, due to an outmoded shipping act aimed at preserving the merchant marine.

The industry has tried one approach to the Canadian problem (the suggested quota and tariff), and in so doing created hard feelings in many quarters. The case for complete removal of the Jones Act will also

cause friction, but the stakes are large, and the entire industry is involved. Secretary Hodges' decision last week proves that the industry at least has a fighting chance.

[From the Seattle Times, Dec. 5, 1962]

ANOTHER VICTORY IN LUMBER AID BATTLE

An important step toward enabling American west coast lumbermen to overcome a competitive advantage held by Canadian lumber shippers in the prime American east coast market has been taken by a Maritime Administration examiner.

The examiner ruled that a ban on foreign-flag ships in domestic trade could be relaxed under certain conditions in the movement of lumber cargoes from the Northwest to Puerto Rico.

Canadian lumbermen now monopolize the Puerto Rican market because they can send cargoes to the island at less cost in foreign-flag ships denied to their American competitors.

This advantage has helped the Canadians to expand greatly their share of the lucrative Atlantic market.

If the examiner's ruling is upheld there will be a precedent that we hope will be followed in regard to lumber shipments to the east coast.

The hard-pressed Northwest lumber industry cannot follow up any such precedent merely by filing new applications with the Maritime Administration, however. Any further relaxation of existing maritime law will require additional congressional action.

That is why it is vital that the Washington and Oregon congressional delegations fight lumber's battle as vigorously in the new Congress, in a nonelection year, as they did in the recent pre-election session.

And renewed White House support is equally vital. The amending of laws to permit use of foreign vessels in intercoastal lumber shipments was one of six points set forth by President Kennedy last July as possible means of aiding the Northwest lumber industry.

Much of that six-point Kennedy program still remains in the category of unfinished business.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BARTLETT, ERVIN, McCARTHY, McGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, PEARSON, PRUTTY, RANDOLPH, TOWER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would simplify Federal grants-in-aid to States for public health services and provide greater flexibility in the allocation of certain categorical public health service funds in the States. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

This proposed legislation was drafted as the result of the second report to the President by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member.

Last year, on August 1, 1962, I introduced S. 3592, legislation designed to simplify grants-in-aid to the States for public health services to permit greater State flexibility in the use of public health allotments. I plan to reintroduce that measure now.

The proposed legislation originated under the title S. 1467, a bill I introduced on March 29, 1961. S. 3592 included technical changes in the bill. It reflects

both the judgment of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of State health officers, and other experts in the field. Formal resolutions urging enactment of the measure have been adopted by the Governors' conference, the executive committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Association of State Budget Officers, Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of County Officials, the American Municipal Association, and the National Legislation Conference of the Council of State Governments.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944, to permit States, at the discretion of the Governor in each case, to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one of five health categories to one or more of the other four such categories. The following five categorical grants are involved: General health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. The bill would not affect the remaining categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

In addition, the bill would establish a uniform allotment and matching formula for Federal grants to States in the special categories listed above. A number of different formulas now apply to these five categories.

Under the bill, funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of population, with matching requirements established according to per capita income in the individual States. Matching requirements would range from one-third State funds to two-thirds Federal funds for the lowest income States, to two-thirds State funds to one-third Federal funds for the highest income States. This formula follows the general principle established under the Hill-Burton program.

This proposal, Mr. President, is designed to improve the flexibility of federally supported public health service programs administered by the States, without removing the present overall direction of these programs in accordance with the priorities set by Congress. Initially, several of these categories were established to allow the Federal Government to stimulate State activity. Today the major cost is borne by the States, with the Federal Government playing an important supporting role.

By allowing the States to transfer up to one-third of the funds in the five categories listed, we would provide sufficient flexibility for State administrators in meeting peculiar and changing local needs, without endangering the integrity of the overall program. It should be noted that the proposed allowance for transfers would not be applied to the categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children services, since functional lines of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States do not coincide in these categories.

This bill, Mr. President, represents the considered opinion of members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, State and Territorial health and budget officers, and other experts in this field. It offers a sensible improvement in an important facet of intergovernmental relations.

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

The bill (S. 1051) to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEXICO—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 944, a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added.

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

EXTENSION OF DAVIS-BACON ACT TO CONTRACTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 945, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations, that the names of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added.

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

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY LABOR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 1, 1963, the names of Senators CLARK, DOUGLAS, INOUE, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 981) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on March 1, 1963.

PROBLEMS OF UNCHECKED GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as we all know, this week marks the anni-

versary of the beginning of what we know as the New Deal program. Just 30 years ago saw the inauguration of a massive effort to tax and spend our way out of a worldwide depression which was to pave the way for Federal intervention into almost every field of American endeavor. At that time, Mr. President, we really had a depression. Millions were unemployed, hundreds of factories lay idle, banks were closing, and soup kitchens and apple vendors were constant reminders of our economic plight. In other words, at that stage in our history there was need for action by the Federal Government in the national interest. I do not agree with the action that was taken, and history has proven that it was not the right kind of action. Make-work projects buttressed by heavy Government control over private endeavor did not do the job. Many years after the advent of the New Deal and its programs, the depression with all its attendant unemployment and human misery was still with us. And it remained right up until the outbreak of World War II, when the necessity to rearm in a hurry put our people and our factories back to work.

Now, Mr. President, I believe it is important for us today to understand the difference between that period and the one in which we now live. Today, for example, we have a high level of employment but a persistent and nagging problem of technological unemployment. Today, we have the highest level of savings and consumer purchasing power in our history. We have the highest standard of living in the world. We also have some very tough problems largely because of unchecked Government spending and a demonstrated policy of fiscal irresponsibility related to deficit financing. We have a serious adverse balance in our international payments, a sorely threatened gold reserve, a dollar which has lost much of its former standing in world financial circles, and a growing problem with foreign competition.

And today, Mr. President, we find another New Deal—this time called the New Frontier—offering the same old answers that we got 30 years ago. Despite the vastly changed conditions, we find the Government today parceling out PWA projects and funneling funds into so-called depressed areas as though the soup kitchens had returned. We find the Congress debating what amounts to a new 1963 version of the Civilian Conservation Corps. We find the administration pushing new social security legislation designed to subject the American people to Federal paternalism "from the cradle to the grave." We find the Executive reaching again for more and more power to regulate the national economy.

When we get right down to it, the New Frontier's idea of meeting our economic problems is the same one the New Deal used—bigger Government and heavier public spending.

Mr. President, this is not only a negative response to the pressing economic problems which face us as a nation; it is a reactionary response. It is a return to old methods—methods which were thoroughly tried in the 1930's and which

were found wanting. This whole idea of trying to ease unemployment and growth problems through the use of printing press money will get us into more trouble than we are in already.

Let us say goodbye to the 1930's and the depression-born economic thinking which has no application to the problems which confront us in a time of record consumer spending. Let us remember that panaceas and Government-financed nostrums did not work 30 years ago because they were not sound. Let us today profit from those mistakes and begin attacking our economic problems with realism and responsibility.

PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FISH FARMERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas recently passed a resolution urging the acceleration of programs designed to assist fish farmers. The fish farming industry has a great future but much information is needed on proper production, processing, and marketing techniques before the industry can develop its full potential. I was the author of the legislation which led to the establishment of the Fish Farm Experiment Station at Stuttgart, Ark. The work that is being carried out under the jurisdiction of this station, and other related facilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service, is designed to solve many of the problems which have hampered the growth of the fish farming industry.

I am hopeful that the work of both the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on fish farming problems can be expedited in the next fiscal year. This work is of great importance to all States having fish farming potential.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and Federal agencies to accelerate research programs with respect to harvesting, processing, and marketing of farm-produced fish, and to establish uniform laws and regulations defining fish farming

Whereas the State of Arkansas has 4,500,000 acres of idle land which is ideally suited to the production of farm grown fish; and

Whereas experts have estimated that such idle land is capable of an annual production of farm grown fish having a value of \$100 million; and

Whereas the United States is presently importing 50 percent of its fish and fish products, thereby indicating a great need to increase domestic fish production to halt the flow of U.S. dollars which are going to other countries for the purchase of fish; and

Whereas there is presently approximately 100,000 acres of privately owned reservoirs in the State of Arkansas that contain several million dollars worth of valuable fish which are not being harvested due to the lack of technical knowledge of harvesting, processing, and marketing; and

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government, and the regulations of a number of Federal administrative agencies, are con-

flicting with regard to fish farming, and because of such conflicting laws the production of farm-produced fish is being handicapped at the present time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the house of representatives concurring therein), That, the General Assembly of Arkansas respectfully requests the Congress of the United States, and the appropriate Federal agencies, to take necessary steps to accelerate research programs applicable to farm-produced fish, with such research to especially determine economic means of harvesting, processing, and marketing farm-produced fish to the end that the obviously great potentials and possibilities of this new farm crop may be realized and thousands of acres of idle land may be put into production with the resulting increase in employment and business activity attendant thereto; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies are urged to enact and promulgate a common and uniformly accepted definition of fish farming to the extent that fish farming may be recognized, for the various Federal purposes, as any other agricultural pursuit; be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution a copy thereof shall be furnished, by the secretary of state, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are not superlatives enough to describe the beauty of my State of Wyoming and in particular the majesty of Grand Teton National Park. People who visit there often are completely transformed by their contact with the works of God and nature.

To illustrate this point I cite an article in the March issue of Redbook magazine written by a Detroit housewife who, with her family, spent 2 weeks at the park. Her account of that trip is concrete testimony of the wonders of that park. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WYOMING: WILD AND WONDERFUL

(By Mary Augusta Rodgers)

Two weeks was all the time we had last summer, and we went from Detroit, Mich., to Jackson Hole, Wyo. It's a long trip—more than 3,000 miles there and back, the way we did it—and we were tired and travel stained when we returned. A neighbor, very natty in a white shirt and Bermuda shorts, observed our homecoming. "This was a vacation?" he inquired, puffing judiciously on his pipe.

Ah, but it was. One of the best we've ever had.

We had first seen the Jackson Hole country on a long trip the year before, and ever since, we had wanted to return. The scenery is magnificent, of course, but that's not the whole story; our first trip left us with the impression that the West is a vast area of incredible beauty and we were dazzled by it. But some places have that indefinable, vital note of particular personality, just as some people do, and Jackson Hole turned out to be the place for us. Those mountains, those

lakes, that valley, that sky. We could hardly wait to see it all again.

We left Detroit on a Friday, behind schedule. Packing turned out to be more of a job than we had anticipated—it always is, but we never learn. "Off at dawn," my husband and I cry hopefully the night before; the boys listen, smile, and make bets about how late we'll actually be; and the most cynical among them is the one who wins. At 17 (Pete), 16 (Billy), and 14 (Mark), they naturally are prepared for the worst. Only Kitsy, who is 7, still regards her parents with absolute confidence. For example, we were 50 miles on our way when she mentioned that she had let the cat back into the house.

"But don't worry," she said cheerfully. "Daddy'll fix it."

Two hours later we were on our way. Again.

We dipped down to Chicago to pick up our seventh passenger, my husband's younger brother; this gave us five drivers for our caravan—a station wagon and a compact bus—so we took turns driving through the night, had breakfast in Wisconsin, lunch in Minnesota, and dinner in South Dakota. We camped for the night at a roadside park, and the next morning we drove through Pierre and headed for the Badlands National Monument. This was our first official sight-seeing stop, and we had plenty of company. I remember watching a boy who was taking a picture of his father, who was taking a movie shot of his wife, who was taking a picture of the Badlands. It is a desertlike landscape, strangely colored and shimmering in the heat, the hills eroded into shapes resembling spires and towers and battlements.

Another night at a roadside park, this time in Wyoming, and we awoke to a brilliant summer day, hot and clear, with sunflowers and black-eyed Susans blooming along the highway. The land was beginning to look authentically western—sagebrush, grazing herds of cattle, cottonwood trees growing by sparkling streams, mesas gray-blue in the distance.

The drive through the Big Horn Mountains was spectacular. "Wow," Uncle Larry cried, giving up on the search for the mot just. Granite Pass, Shell Canyon, Greybull, Shoshone—the very names sounded like a beating drum, and the views were thrilling almost everywhere.

By the time we drove around Yellowstone Lake at twilight, though, we were having trouble reacting to anything but the thought of a sandwich and a cup of coffee. Night fell, the road ran on endlessly, a bear appeared for a moment in the headlights of the bus—but we'd already seen 10 bears and a herd of elk. There was no moon and the sky was dark. We couldn't see the mountains, but we could feel them looming, like hidden giants. When we reached the Jenny Lake campground in the Grand Teton National Park, we were greeted by a sign which stated positively: "Camp Area Full."

We parked near the entrance and fell asleep just as we were. At 6 o'clock in the morning a ranger, looking clear-eyed, neat, and outrageously rested, emerged from the ranger station and removed the sign. The rush that followed was something like the opening of the Cherokee Strip. We were seized by the homesteader's fever, and when we finally found a good site and started driving in tent pegs, we felt triumphantly: This land is ours. We didn't even take time to look around until we had signed in at the ranger station. No matter. The mountains were still there.

They rise without foothills, dominating the valley, the peaks splendid in the light of a summer morning, glaciers shining in the sun. Their reflections lie on the surface of the lakes, their shadows fall across

meadows full of wildflowers and the Snake River winds at their feet. The wind, blowing over the mountain slopes, smells of snow and pine. Remote from the big cities and the crowded States, the valley of Jackson Hole has the feeling of a high-altitude oasis, a natural version of Shangri-La.

Headquarters of the Grand Teton National Park are at Moose, 7 miles away, but much park activity centers at Jenny Lake. There is a log-cabin museum, a little shop, a boat dock, a horse corral and the Exum School of Mountaineering. Fishermen have Jenny Lake to themselves; the swimmers go down to String Lake or follow the trail beyond it to Leigh Lake. During the day, cars from nearly every State line the road near the ranger station, but there never seem to be crowds of people milling about. This is vigorous country, and even the most settled, sedentary, suburban types are irresistibly drawn to be out and doing.

Besides the Jenny Lake campground, there are others at Colter Bay, Jackson Lake and Gros Ventre (pronounced Grovont, unless you want to be considered a tenderfoot and a square). Since these are all national park campgrounds, there is no fee for the tent sites. Each site is a large space shaded by pine trees, with a parking turnout, a cooking grate and a picnic table; and there are chipmunks and ground squirrels to add to that lived-in look. Every area has a community woodpile and rubbish is collected every day. Comfort stations are maintained—although camping is camping, after all, and there is nothing especially comfortable about getting there from your tent at 6 a.m. in the rain. A sense of adventure helps—one girl told me that when leaving the Ladies' one evening, she opened the door, and before she could step out a bear stepped in. "I like to think," she added piously, "that it was a lady bear."

There are other facilities in the park, however, besides free camping sites. At Colter Bay, the Grand Teton Lodge Co. operates a trailer park with utility connections for 112 trailers, a compound of heated log cabins with baths, a tent village. The tents are set on concrete, backed with logs and equipped with electric lights; each is furnished with an outdoor grill, a wood-burning stove, double-deck bunks, a table and benches; all other housekeeping necessities, from sleeping bags to coffee pots, are available for rental; and thus it is at last possible to camp a la carte.

There is a visitors' information center at Colter Bay, an outdoor amphitheater, a swimming beach, a lakeside marina, a horse corral, a grocery store, coffee shop, taproom and (here's where it gets really exciting) a laundry with automatic washing machines and adjoining shower rooms. The showers cost 35 cents, slightly more if you forget your own towels, and all campers know that there are times when a hot shower is an event so luxurious that it verges on a debauch. Even a wait in the laundry can be a pleasure; there is always the bulletin board to study. People want to share rides, swap equipment, advertise the lost and found, leave messages for friends. The messages often provide food for thought—"Dot and Sandy: Sorry we missed you, second honeymoon, Mother off for Las Vegas, love, Betty and George"—but the most arresting in my experience was a notice written on a file card in a flowing Palmer penmanship hand that said quite simply: "Wanted, old garter. Need not be in working order." A local telephone number followed.

(My husband felt that garter was obviously a misspelling for guitar. I felt that life is mysterious and who are we to know?)

The Jackson Lake Lodge and the Jenny Lake Lodge are located as their names indicate, both operated by the Grand Teton Lodge Co. The Jackson Lake Lodge has cottages in addition to the main house, hotel

service, a dining room, bar, and barber and beauty shops. In the main lounge, huge windows frame a spectacular view of the mountains behind Jackson Lake, and ordinarily energetic guests have been known to sit there for hours, fascinated by the play of light and shadow. A variety of programs is presented in the lodge auditorium; the Laubins, a couple who are experts on Indian culture, give a popular recital of Indian dances every Friday night.

At Jenny Lake, 35 log cabins, many of them the carefully restored cabins of original settlers, cluster around the lodge, which is small, cozy, and famous for its food and service. Every Sunday there is a buffet, with hors d'oeuvres packed against an ice swan, a lavish supply of entrees and salads, and the offerings of a reckless and gifted pastry chef. The buffet is open to the public for the price of the meal, and many campers avail themselves of the opportunity, granting that hot dogs and beans taste great over an open fire but feeling that there is no reason to be fanatical on the subject.

Finally, there are a number of privately owned dude or guest ranches within the boundaries of the Grand Teton Park, and hotel and motel accommodations in the town of Jackson.

Our own tents at the Jenny Lake campground looked like a small village. There was a wing tent for the children's dormitory, a pup tent for Uncle Larry's bachelor quarters, and the bus for Mother and Father. The bus, fitted out with water tank, icebox, table, storage shelves, a couch that converted into a double bed and even tie-back plaid curtains at the windows, was known as the Officers' Club. As camp cook and housekeeper, I need a lot of equipment, although I have improved since our first camping trip, when—inspired by heaven knows what dream of gracious living among the tall pines—I took along a soufflé pan and a steam iron.

Those who love this country give many different reasons, but essentially what they all are saying is the same. A businessman who has been bringing his family to the same dude ranch for 15 years talked about what he liked to do—the fishing, the pack trips—and then, with mounting enthusiasm, about what he liked not to do. "No television, no radio—I hardly even read letters. And the telephone connections are so lousy," he added ecstatically, "that the office finally quit trying to get in touch with me."

The most famous visitor last summer was Astronaut John Glenn. We were in Jackson buying groceries when we heard a hubbub in the next block, inquired about it and learned that Glenn and his family were there. As long as they were in town they couldn't move without attracting an admiring crowd, but that afternoon they left for a week's camping trip in the mountains. The ranger who guided them up to their first night's campsite said afterward that John Glenn slid off his horse, looked at the mountain meadow—unchanged since the days it was known only to the Indians—and said suddenly, "For the first time in a year I feel free."

It was August and the weather was superb. As the days went by it was hard not to feel that we all were better people, in some basic way, just for being in such beautiful country. Certainly we were healthier. We used String Lake as a bathtub—in such a setting, a pretty glorious bathtub—but Leigh Lake was our favorite and we went there nearly every day. It was 2 miles through pine woods to the sandy spit where we liked to settle down and sun bathe and swim. The first time, this felt like a real hike, but in a few days the 2 miles meant no more than a stroll to the corner mailbox back home. The lake water was cold, clear, amazingly invigorating after the first breathless plunge, and it was wonderful to lie in the sun, gazing up at the grandeur of Teewinot Mountain against a brassy summer sky, lulled by a piny breeze and the sound of birds.

We seldom planned more than a day ahead, and yet the time fell into a pattern. Breakfast and dinner were substantial meals, eaten at camp; lunch was usually a picnic of bread and cheese and fruit wherever we happened to be. At night we sometimes strolled over to the amphitheater to hear nature talks by the park naturalists. One night the climbing ranger discussed mountaineering and illustrated his talk with color slides. A particularly dizzying shot showed a climber inching his way up what appeared to be a sheer wall of ice. The audience gasped, and the ranger remarked amiably, "You know that is much harder than it looks."

The country absorbed us. We went riding and saw a moose. The boys and Uncle Larry tried the fishing at the Gros Ventre River and took an all-day fishing trip down the Snake; it rained that afternoon, and they were interested to see the rubber rafts from Jackson Lake Lodge float majestically by, the passengers shielded from the rain by plastic sheets and the rafts looking like big, gift-wrapped packages. One day we hiked along the Indian Paintbrush Trail to the Continental Divide. It seemed odd to ask first at the ranger station about snow conditions in August, but a snow cornice may block the divide at any time. Another day we took the Glacier Trail to Amphitheater Lake, which begins at Lupine Meadow and ends at timber line after a 3,000-foot rise in 5½ miles of trail. (A booklet called "Teton Trails," for sale at the visitors' centers in the park, is very useful; and so is another, "Yellowstone and Grand Teton Wild Flowers." You're not supposed to pick the wildflowers, but you might as well peer at them knowingly.)

One long day we went to Yellowstone. A day is not nearly long enough to see all the areas of interest, but we saw Old Faithful and the geyser basins and the great canyon of the Yellowstone River. The stones are yellow; the lodgepole pines are dark green; the river roars furiously in the canyon; the ground steams and bubbles and boils and shoots forth geysers. It's wild, weird country; the Indians thought it was inhabited by devils and ghosts, and no wonder. We saw mule deer and a couple of coyotes and bears, bears, bears. Kitsy never failed to shriek happily at the sight of a bear, even the 18th that afternoon—she was looking for Yogi Bear (who's always in the ra-a-anger's hair).

It is hard to imagine the excuse for many of the adult tourists, who behave as if the bears were stuffed and provided solely to serve as props for comic photos. Every season about 10 or 15 visitors to the park are mauled or bitten by the bears, and the wonder is that the figure is so low. Some people do incredible things; one man put his baby in a bear's arms and then stepped back to snap a picture. (The bear, fortunately, dropped the baby.) We were particularly fretful about the motorists who at the sight of a bear slammed on brakes and stopped in the middle of fast-moving highway traffic. Impervious to the cars piling up behind them, they rolled down their windows and teased the bear with sandwiches and candy bars, all the while yelling, "Get a picture of him with his mouth open like that" and, "Oh, isn't he cute."

In Grand Teton Park we went to see the park museum at Menors Ferry and exhibits at the park headquarters at Moose, and to see where the famous Gros Ventre Slide occurred. The scar is still clearly visible where a mountain fell, like an avalanche of snow, into the valley, even without the explicit park sign: "The Gros Ventre slide occurred June 23, 1925. It dammed the river and created Lower Slide Lake. On May 18, 1927, the dam broke and the rushing water flooded the town of Kelly 4 miles below. Six lives were lost, ranch homes de-

stroyed, livestock drowned, and other extensive damage was caused." And one afternoon we took a picnic lunch up to the top of Signal Mountain. On one side is a view of the Teton range, on the other a magnificent view of the valley, green with trees, blue in the shadow of the mountains, gray with sagebrush. The park sign begins like a poem: "Here glaciers met and melted."

It is my unsolicited opinion that the taxpayer's dollar seldom returns to him in more benign form than in the services of the national parks and their staffs. Their constant effort is to achieve two opposing goals—to preserve what little is left of this country's natural wilderness and to enable the public to use and enjoy it. The public—that's all of us—loves its parks, but its embrace can be as crushing as the bear's. A wrangler, leading a group on horseback up the trail to Lake Solitude, was heard to mutter, "Any day now they'll change the name to Lake Multitude."

A. B. Guthrie's novel "The Big Sky" is full of feeling for the Teton country, and at the end one of the characters says, "There was beaver for us and free country and a big way of livin' and everything we done it looks like we done against ourselves and couldn't do different if we'd knowed. We went to get away and to enjoy ourselves free and easy, but folks were bound to foller and beaver to get scarce and Injuns to be killed or tamed, and all the time the country gettin' safer and better known. We ain't see the end of it yet."

Like the South, the West is half history, half legend, and they have a good time with both in the town of Jackson. Every night at 7 at the main intersection, they try Clover the Killer. The stage clatters in; there is a holdup; the blank bullets blaze and the horses rear; the Cache Creek posse rides again. Clover is captured and dragged before the bar of justice, an archway made entirely of elk horns. "Hang him?" the announcer-judge asks, his scarf not entirely concealing the cord of the microphone around his neck. "Hang him, hang him," the kids (some of them age 60) holler. In the interests of mercy and the next night's show, Clover is allowed to shoot it out with the sheriff instead. Bang, bang. Clover falls and twitches artistically. The crowd applauds. Overhead the traffic light goes back on.

It's a great show. Old hands in Jackson will tell you that if you're planning to go to a restaurant, 7 o'clock is the time to get there and order dinner.

There is the Pink Garter Theater, the Cowboy Bar, and the Silver Dollar Cafe. When the stagecoach is not being used for holdups, a young man (known as Killer Clay on the nights he substitutes for Clover) sells tickets for rides around the square. Some gaudy cowboy outfits are seen on the boardwalks of Jackson, the most resplendent usually worn by big-city citizens who wouldn't know a corral from a calaboose, but the man who set my hair in a local beauty shop had on a rather striking outfit too, complete with sombrero and gun and holster set. When he bent to roll up the back curls, he looked as though he should be shoeing a horse.

But it's not all enjoyable claptrap, the essence of 10,000 cowboy movies and TV dramas and Frankie Laine singing, "Ghost Riders in the Sky." Look anywhere. This is the country of John Colter, who had been with the Lewis and Clark Expedition and who set out for the unknown Western mountains to see what the fur trapping might be like and if the Indians were interested in trading. That was—well, there was an argument, not only about the date but about Colter's ever reaching Jackson Hole. Then in 1930 a plow, turning over virgin homestead land, uncovered a piece of dirt-covered rock, crudely carved to resemble a man's head. On one side was scratched a name,

"John Colter," and on the other side the date, "1808."

This is the country of hunters and trappers, scouts and guides, and men prospecting for gold—men like Bridger and David E. Jackson, and Beaver Dick Leigh with his Shoshonean wife named Jenny. The settlers and the farmers came last. But they stayed.

By the end of our first week in the Teton country we felt like settlers ourselves. Sun-tanned and hearty, the boys wore blue jeans and cowboy hats with ease and just the proper hint of swagger, and were talking about coming back another summer and getting ranch jobs on their own. Even Kitsy decided to give up her lifelong ambition to be a nurse and grow up to be a lady wrangler instead. Uncle Larry, whose previous idea of hardship was a Martini with too much vermouth in it, had formed the habit of having a swim in String Lake every morning before breakfast, about 7 a.m. Year-round mountaineering men were amazed. "Are you out of your mind?" they asked frankly. "That water is cold."

When everybody else in the family decided to go to mountain-climbing school, I decided to go along. And that was a mistake. First we went by boat to Hidden Falls, hiked to a lovely spot—I am always one to notice the view—and learned how to tie knots and handle a rope. "No, no, Mary," the guide said. "Your other left hand." The fact of the matter is that I have always detested rope tying in any form since Girl Scout days, and besides that I am afraid of heights and nobody should really expect me to cope with this sort of thing. Nevertheless, the next thing I knew, I was scraping all the skin off my knees and elbows trying to get up a steep slab of rock, while the guide stood above and shouted down, "Listen to me, Mary—stop cowering and come on." We went over three or four pitches, each worse than the last, and then it was time for lunch. After lunch we were going to try rappelling. It was explained to me, the class coward, that rappelling was different. Lots of fun—in fact, a real lark. I was just beginning to feel optimistic when the sky darkened, thunder rolled, rain began pouring down and the lark aspect of the afternoon dimmed. The other members of the class began to rappel and I observed the procedure. There is this rope, see, and you put it around you in a certain fashion, and then you step backward off a cliff. The rain poured and the wind grew cold and I huddled on a little ledge on the side of the cliff and wondered just what turn I had taken on life's highway to land me in this particular spot. Finally it was my turn. Taking the rope, I tried to hold it in the approved manner. I looked down. Then I slipped in the mud and cut my knee on a rock. I looked down again. And then—let's put it this way: I know enough to come in out of the rain.

It is only fair to emphasize that everyone else in the family felt different. They thought that climbing was exhilarating and challenging and generally terrific and mother was chicken. My husband and the two older boys immediately made plans to climb "the Grand"—the Grand Teton, highest peak in the range at 13,766 feet, and a 2-day venture with a guide.

The morning they left was beautiful, but by early afternoon the sky was cloudy and by dusk it was raining again. "Raining here, it's snowing up there," someone said.

It was a long night—I awoke with a start, looked at my watch, and saw that it was 4 a.m., just the time the climbing party would start toward the peak—and a longer day; and then about 4 o'clock they came into view along the Garnet Canyon Trail. They'd had everything—snow, hail, and electrical storm. "We were bombed," the guide said wearily.

"Never again," my husband announced, back at the camp, and started to drift off to sleep before he'd finished pulling his boots off.

"One of the greatest days of my life," was his version of the climb the next morning.

Even I felt that this was the climax, and it was just as well that the time had come to leave. Following our own quaint custom, we planned to leave at 10 in the morning, and actually got away about 3 that afternoon. It was strenuous work, breaking camp; at one point Uncle Larry stopped and directed our attention to the boys, who were lounging comfortably at the picnic table, reading magazines.

"Note that," he muttered. "The coffee break at the OK Corral."

Going home, the way seemed quicker, and more tiring. We went through Nebraska and Iowa, driving through the night again. I found myself thinking about the things that we'd wanted to do and hadn't had time for. We'd wanted to take the trip to Alaska Basin on horseback; we'd wanted to see the melodrama at the Pink Garter in Jackson; and ride the chair lift; and ride to Wilson, just a few miles beyond Jackson, to see the Saturday night rodeo; and go over to the Jackson Lake Lodge and take the all-day float trip down the Snake; and try a week of wilderness camping in the Wind River Mountains, part of the Bridger National Forest. * * *

Next time, next time.

Thinking about what we had done, I found that I was remembering moods and odd moments: the sun and the clear, cold water at Leigh Lake; a turn in the path toward Paintbrush Divide, a breathtaking view, and the sudden notion that it promised all sorts of things; simplicity and freedom and the natural rhythm of the changing seasons and the sun and moon and stars. The frontier is gone but the lure is still there, and in the Tetons the mountains and lakes and forests still remain, beautiful and unchanged.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, tonight, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman will enter the pulpit and deliver his last sermon at Temple Israel in St. Louis, where he has served God, his congregation, his city, and his fellow man since 1929.

Among his major interests have been combating prejudice against Negroes and building interfaith relationships, and the great progress St. Louis has made in these areas is flaming testimonial to the effectiveness of his efforts.

Mr. President, I am sure our colleagues would find the story of Rabbi Isserman's 33 years in St. Louis interesting and inspirational, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent feature article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 21, written by Clarissa Start and entitled "Rabbi Isserman—Always on Side of the Angels."

The rabbi says he considers himself lucky to have spent such a long span of years in St. Louis. While I agree wholeheartedly with that sentiment, for St. Louis is indeed a beautiful and wonderful city in which to live, I would add to his comment a further note: "Rabbi Isserman, St. Louis is lucky that you chose her for your home, and St. Louisans are thankful that you chose them to be your neighbors."

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

RABBI ISSERMAN—ALWAYS ON SIDE OF THE ANGELS

(By Clarissa Start)

"I was very lucky," said Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, as he tilted back in his chair, glanced ceilingward and let his mind revert to the past. "I came to St. Louis at the time of the golden age of the liberal clergy in this city. There were such men as Jay Stocking at Pilgrim Congregational, George Campbell at Union Avenue Christian, Bishop Will Scarlett and Dean Sidney Sweet at Christ Church Cathedral, Ivan Lee Holt of St. John's Methodist, William Bitting at Second Baptist, Father William Mullally of St. Mary Magdalen and Father Russell Wilbur of Notre Dame de Lourdes Catholic Churches."

No list of the liberal clergy of St. Louis would be complete without the name of Rabbi Isserman himself. The senior rabbi at Temple Israel, who is retiring next month, has been an active, constructive force in the community since he came here in 1929.

His ministry has been such a successful one that it is hard to believe he hesitated to come to St. Louis from Toronto for fear he wouldn't make the grade.

"I felt secure there and was afraid to come here," he recalls. "My predecessor at Temple Israel, Rabbi Leon Harrison, was a great orator. People crowded the temple to hear him speak. I was sure I could never take his place."

Rabbi Isserman was only 31 years old at the time but he had made a name for himself with his first three congregations.

Because he came to St. Louis from Canada, many people assumed he was Canadian, but actually he was born in Antwerp, Belgium, and came to this country with his family when he was 8. He attended school in Newark, N.J., and then went to Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, the University of Cincinnati and the University of Pennsylvania, where he took his M.A.

He served as rabbi in Paducah, Ky., Philadelphia and then Toronto, where he made news by participating in the first Christian-Jewish pulpit exchange in Canadian history and by heading a campaign to abolish corporal punishment in Toronto schools.

Despite his trepidation about coming to St. Louis, he finally decided to accept the invitation and the challenge, and arrived here on September 1, 1929. His first duty here was to participate in the funeral services for Sigmund Baer. A few weeks later, he performed his first marriage ceremony in St. Louis, that of Louis Rothschild and Emily Bettman. On September 27 he was formally installed, with the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise acting as installing officer and Julius Glaser representing the congregation.

The new rabbi soon found St. Louis to be a friendly place, especially in its interfaith relationships.

"The thing that has made mine a very rich ministry," says Rabbi Isserman, "is the liberal attitude of the community and the friendliness to differences. I think this climate was created by the Forty-eighters, those German immigrants who came here in 1848—men like Carl Schurz, who believed in civil liberties. They kept Missouri from becoming a slave state and going with the Confederacy. The temper of the community was hospitable to other points of view."

He remembers with special warmth his first meeting with Dean (later Bishop) Scarlett, of whom he had heard so much.

"I went to Bishop Tuttle Memorial and got permission to go upstairs; he lived in an apartment on the fifth floor," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "When he came to the door, I said, 'I'm Rabbi Harrison's successor.' He

said, 'I'm Will Scarlett—call me Will.' I said, 'Call me Ferd,' and that was it."

The two men conferred with Archbishop Glennon and out of the meeting came plans for the St. Louis Seminar of Christians and Jews, held in the spring of 1930. It was a 2-day discussion period, with an audience comprised of 333 Catholics, 333 Jews, and 333 Protestants, with Gov. Henry S. Caulfield making the 1000th member.

"We called it our religious prejudice disarmament conference," said Rabbi Isserman. "It had a terrific impact on the community, and paved the way for much good interfaith work which followed. Teams of rabbis, priests, and ministers visited schools and went around the State on pilgrimages."

"Today, of course, the National Conference of Christians and Jews performs this work on a national scale and in a more intensive way, but in this community we were the pioneers. And I think the results have been evident. I remember when Louis P. Aloe ran for mayor how big a part prejudice played in his defeat. Last year Larry Roos—a boy whom I confirmed—was elected county supervisor and the issue of religion, to my knowledge, was not raised."

Also in the early 1930's Rabbi Isserman founded and became chairman of the Social Justice Commission of St. Louis, an organization of 15 clergymen and 10 professors. The late Dean Joseph Husslein of St. Louis University was a member and so was Wiley Rutledge, who went on to become a U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

"We found that rabbis, priests, and ministers often saw eye to eye on the social gospel on which the great prophets had spoken," he said. "In our union we had a great deal of strength."

Most of the accomplishments of the Social Justice Commission were in the settling of labor disputes. The commission settled a dispute between a large dairy and its milk producers; it settled a taxicab strike and a milk wagon drivers' strike and it averted a streetcar strike.

"We tried unsuccessfully to settle a quarrel between rival coal mine unions," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "John L. Lewis came to this meeting and I still remember his dramatic speech."

Rabbi Isserman visited Nazi Germany in 1933 and was so moved that he wrote a book, "Sentenced to Death," predicting the wholesale slaughter of Jews, a prophecy which was looked on as exaggerated at the time.

He had served with the Central Infantry Officers at Camp Grant, Ill., in World War I, and in World War II was granted a 6-month leave of absence to serve with the American Red Cross in the Tunisian campaign. At the end of the war he was outspoken on the subject of world peace and atomic control.

In recent years, one of his major interests has been combating prejudice against Negroes. But his stand was made clear long ago. The death of Henry Bibb, Negro janitor of Temple Israel for 47 years, occurred early in Rabbi Isserman's ministry. Funeral services for the faithful employee were held in the temple with Rabbi Isserman officiating.

He has had Negro singers and speakers at Temple Israel. One of the achievements of which he is proudest is the nursery foundation, interracial nursery.

"Some people said this would create an uproar," Rabbi Isserman recalled, adding drily, "It created such an uproar that 3 years later the United Fund took it over."

Occasionally some of the members of his congregation have differed with him, but in all the years there have been few resignations over principle.

"Many disagreed with me but respected my right to my own opinion," says Rabbi Isserman.

The Reform congregation has more than doubled since he became its senior rabbi. In the 1930's, in the midst of the depression, it seemed that plans to build Temple Israel house next to the temple at Kingshighway and Washington Boulevard were stalled. But Rabbi Isserman secured a pledge from the late Charles Stix that his firm would float a bond issue to lend the temple \$250,000. Rabbi Isserman obtained from members of the congregation personal pledges for \$65,000 to underwrite the interest on the bonds for 5 years, and the project went ahead.

Last fall the new Temple Israel house of worship at Ladue and Spodeo roads was dedicated. Appropriately enough, monumental sculptures were given to the temple by Christ Church Cathedral, a gracious reciprocal gesture for the baptismal doors which the temple had given the cathedral on the 10th anniversary of Bishop Scarlett's consecration.

"There are Old and New Testament symbols on the doors," said Rabbi Isserman, "symbolic of the fact, that, as the doors swing side by side without conflict, so can the faiths work side by side."

In addition to his many other interests, Rabbi Isserman is an art collector, and the walls of his home at 82 Arundel Place are covered with paintings, both the abstracts which he admires and the more conventional works which his wife prefers.

The Issermans have two children, a daughter, Mrs. Stanley B. Gertz, who lives on Long Island, and a son, Fred, Jr., vice president of an advertising agency, who lives in Highland Park, Ill.

On March 8, Rabbi Isserman will preach his last sermon at Temple Israel, but he is not retiring from the active ministry. He will be guest rabbi to the Jewish community in Hong Kong, and plans to study Buddhism and Confucian thought during his year there.

Appreciation of other religions has been a special interest which he has not only pursued himself but has instilled in his congregation. A requirement of confirmation at Temple Israel is the study of comparative religions, and representatives of other faiths are brought in to tell the children of their beliefs.

"I think tolerance is bad," says Rabbi Isserman. "Appreciation of other faiths—that's the thing for which we should aim."

Rabbi Isserman will be succeeded at Temple Israel by Rabbi Martin E. Katzenstein. Although Rabbi Isserman will be leaving St. Louis, at least for a year, he hopes to keep in touch with his adopted city by means of taped programs which he will send back to KSD as a continuation of his radio program of many years. There is no doubt that St. Louis will always have a great claim on him.

"St. Louis, in my opinion," he says, "is the capital of interfaith relationships."

QUADRIPARTITE TAX RELIEF

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without an assist from the Congress or the Treasury Department, Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Axe, of Lima, Ohio, have, with the help of the good Lord, provided for themselves a considerable tax cut and at the same time contributed substantially to our gross national product.

I am pleased to extend my sincere and warm congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Axe, who are the proud parents of quadruplets born at St. Rita's Hospital, Lima, Ohio, on Monday, March 4, 1963. The quadruplets, who are reported to be getting along nicely, range from 2 pounds 9 ounces to 4 pounds 2 ounces.

THE DEBT POOLING RACKET

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Sunday the Washington Post carried an article by Leslie Whitten exposing the abuses in the rapidly growing and flourishing debt pooling racket in Washington, D.C. As described in the Washington Post, these so-called debt pooling firms, "offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves, and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors."

In short, the debt poolers offer to help the unwary or unfortunate consumer by charging him a stiff fee and pushing him even further into debt.

I must say that the fact that there are so many people so deeply in debt that they cannot meet their credit obligations is no surprise to me. For 3 years my subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has held extensive hearings on various truth-in-lending bills which would require disclosure of the cost of consumer credit contracts before the consumer signs on the dotted line. The record of those hearings conclusively demonstrates to me that most consumers today are not adequately aware of the finance charges and interest rates they incur when they borrow money or buy on credit. Indeed, one of the managers of a local pooling firm explains their mushrooming growth by saying that—

It is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money you will have a need for [debt consolidation] agencies.

However, it is not clear that these debt pooling firms are helpful to lenders or creditors in collecting their debts. For instance, the better business bureau in Kansas City surveyed lenders and creditors on their attitudes towards these debt pooling firms. The better business bureau found that:

The firms were not useful or beneficial, according to 95 percent of the creditors.

Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.

All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters, for one reason or another, do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Most important, the manager of the Kansas City Better Business Bureau has concluded that, "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorate company is in a position to render."

On the basis of the figures supplied in the Washington Post article, it should be clearly understood that these debt poolers are charging those they are supposedly counseling and aiding as much as a 25-percent fee on the declining unpaid balances on their obligations for these services. This is in addition to the charges by the original creditors.

Of course, there is a vital need for genuine debt counseling services for those who find themselves overburdened with credit obligations. Many creditors are quite willing to provide these services themselves to customers without charge.

Many credit unions long ago established programs of debt counseling for their members. In other instances employers have offered free debt counseling services for their employees. In addition, legal aid societies as well as many types of public service agencies have in the past provided such services to the unfortunate, or unwary, without charge.

However, it is hard to see how those firms described in the Washington Post article could possibly be providing any services which would justify the very steep charges which the debtor is required to pay.

If the facts that the Washington Post have disclosed are true, these firms correctly deserve to be called debt pyramiders, not debt counselors.

I hope the Federal Trade Commission will very carefully examine the advertising these firms doing business in the District of Columbia have engaged in to make sure their representations to the debtor are truthful and accurate. Second, I hope that the District Committee will very carefully investigate this situation to see whether or not the District of Columbia should follow those many other States who have outlawed the debt pooling racket.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRORATING DEBT FIRMS THRIVE HERE

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

Debt consolidators are banned in Virginia and several other States, regulated in still others, but neither regulated nor prohibited in the District. Recently, they have mushroomed here.

There was only one debt consolidation firm here in 1959. Now there are at least five.

They offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors.

They are called proraters because they generally disburse the funds on the basis of which creditor is owed most—or how loudly.

Their advertising is vigorously aimed at those whose debts have put them against the wall, and thousands of area residents have put millions of dollars in debts in the proraters' hands.

"No matter how much you owe, even if you are past due everywhere—we can get you back on your feet without borrowing," asserts a direct-mail card sent by National Budget Services, Inc., a firm set up in 1959, to a couple plagued with debts.

"Get out of debt today," says an advertisement by Budget Counselors, Inc. "All you need is a sincere desire to get out of debt," says Credit Advisors, Inc.

The fact is, the better business bureau points out, that although a debtor who can follow the prorater's payment schedule can eventually get out of debt, the net effect of going to a debt consolidator is a bigger total debt.

For example, Credit Advisors, Inc., set up last year, charges a fee of 12½ percent of gross debt. This means a man with \$1,000 in debts is taking on an additional debt of \$125.

A CASE HISTORY

Eddie Moore, 32, a porter taking home \$50 a week to his family, had this experience with National Budget Services:

Moore, of 5437 C Street SE., owed some \$1,000 to a clothing firm, a furniture store, and two finance firms. His wife, Ella, 22, heeding an advertisement, went to National Budget and signed a contract.

The fee set was \$70 plus a weekly service charge of 35 cents a creditor. The Moores were to pay to National Budget \$21.25 a week with a portion to go toward the fee according to the contract.

"The remainder of said weekly sums," said the contract, "will be disbursed by the company among the applicant's creditors."

The contract went on to say that should the Moores miss a payment for 5 days, they would be liable for the \$70 fee plus service charges. And, the contract continued, the payments could be increased if the creditors insisted.

The Moores paid on time for 4 weeks, a total of \$85, according to their receipts. Of this, according to the firm's own records, only a single check—\$15 to a finance firm—was sent out to creditors.

During the time the Moores did business with National Budget, they paid it \$170, but only \$60 was paid out to creditors, according to National Budget's records. When the Moores protested, they were refunded \$16 as payment in full, the firm said.

The box score: \$60 to creditors, \$94 to National Budget.

M. D. Calahan, manager of National Budget, said the firm tries to get its fee from the debtors' payments first, but he said this often is not possible.

In contrast to the Moore's case, National Budget's files, and those of other debt consolidation firms, show records of regular payments over long periods to creditors by the proraters.

HANDLING NOT ILLEGAL

Nothing in the Moore case was illegal. On the contrary, it followed the contract to the letter. There is no regulatory law in the District to make it otherwise.

The contracts of all five major debt firms specify fees and debtor's payments, but none specify when the first funds start to go out to creditors.

All have provisions for payments to the firm in case of cancellation by the client. These range from \$25 on Credit Advisors contracts to the entire fee on National Budget's.

COMPLAINTS REGISTERED

The better business bureau said it gets about five or six written complaints a month against the debt consolidators. About one telephoned complaint comes in a day, said Leland S. McCarthy, bureau managing director.

In addition, there are eight or nine telephoned inquiries a day, he said. McCarthy said his workers inform callers that the consolidators' service will put them deeper in debt and that the proraters cannot guarantee a reduction in payments already agreed to by the creditor.

Beyond that there is little the Bureau can do. It has no enforcement powers.

The complaints against proraters, said McCarthy, take two general forms.

One, he said, is that the prorater is not making an adequate disbursement to creditors and that queries to the prorater just "get put off."

The other, McCarthy said, is that customers say they are told "creditors will be off your back," and that nevertheless dunning calls continue. The proraters deny they make such promises, he said.

McCarthy said he is closely watching the development of the industry, but he has not taken any general action against it as was done by the Bureau in Kansas City.

There, Joe E. Birkhead, manager of the Bureau, polled banks, loan offices, finance firms, stores, and other merchants. His findings:

The firms were "not useful or beneficial," according to 95 percent of the creditors.

Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.

All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters—for one reason or another—do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Birkhead, in an article in the Bureau's Quarterly Report last year, concluded that "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorater company is in a position to render."

OREGON'S EXPERIENCE

The National Better Business Bureau, in a 1955 survey of the then infant industry, warned that too often laws regulating proraters tend to lend them dignity "as State-licensed organizations while affording little real protection to the public."

Regulation in Oregon did not prevent a debt consolidation firm from closing its doors leaving some 400 debtors holding the bag for \$22,000. A similar case is reported in Chicago.

The alternative to regulation in some States has been outright prohibition. Virginia, for example, outlawed debt consolidation in 1956 except by lawyers.

"Debt poolers were making rash promises," said R. E. Booker, secretary-treasurer of the Virginia State Bar. "There were fly-by-night firms."

In the District, there is no regulatory requirement at all although Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican of Virginia, introduced a bill to prohibit debt consolidators in 1958. At that time, however, there was only one major firm in Washington.

FIRMS BACK REGULATION

Against this background, all the managers of the five major firms in the District say they favor regulation.

Bob Abramson, executive vice president of Credit Advisors, which operates here and under various other names in 20 States, said he did not want the situation here to develop as it did in Michigan.

There, he said, such abuses as a prorater taking \$180 and paying out only \$10 led to legislation in 1961.

Abramson said his firm helped push the Michigan law through and said Credit Advisors follows it even where similar statutes are not in force. It has bonding, licensing and some other provisions.

"I would love to see regulations here with strong controls," he said. "But it would still have to let us operate. I don't want a confidence man in our business. I don't want a well-intentioned jerk in our business."

Robert J. Davids, owner of Debt Help Service, who worked in the District for years with Budget Counselors, the city's oldest firm, is even more explicit.

"I see a danger developing here * * * without regulations we'll have people opening up on every corner. You will be getting places which make false promises and then skip."

Davids, who charges a maximum 10 percent of gross debt plus a service fee of 50 cents monthly per account to a maximum of \$5, said fees should be strictly regulated.

Ten to twelve percent of gross debt plus a small service fee should be maximum, he said, and no more than 15 percent of the fee

should come out of the debtors payments in any one month. As with other firms, he feels licensing should make sure only responsible persons enter the business.

B. H. Feldman, owner of Budget Counselors, said the money he receives one day from clients goes out the same day. Feldman, as with all the agencies but National Budget, said his policy is not to try to collect the fee at the beginning, but in small prorated portions.

Feldman pointed out that he is a local businessman and "is deeply concerned lest new firms hurt the image of our business."

BAN IS PROPOSED

Many members of the credit community, including some loan companies—which often make loans to consolidate several debts in one obligation—finance firms and collection agencies would prefer to see the industry put out of business entirely.

John K. Althaus, general manager of the Credit Bureau, Inc., a firm which records credit ratings and does collection work, said bluntly "They're taking from the man who has nothing but bills."

"They delay payment by debtors of legitimate bills," he said.

Althaus met last fall and again last month with representatives of major stores and other businesses and the matter was discussed, but no public action taken. The retailers, however, have referred the prorating question to a special committee for research and a report.

The consensus, so far, Althaus said, is that many creditors would themselves give the type of advice that debtors get from proraters.

One furniture store spokesman said when a pro-rating firm informs it that they plan to cut a debtor's payments from say \$25 to \$15 a month, the furniture store will often simply cancel the account and move to repossess the furniture.

"It is often uneconomical for us to allow an account which is already overdue to extend still more months because the amount of the payment is cut," said the furniture man.

In fact, some proraters say, they must seek to get reductions in debtors' payments from stores in order to draw up a budget for the debtor. Loan and finance firms, they explain, often refuse flatly to cooperate with them in reducing the amount of payments due each week or month from debtors.

WHY BUSINESS GROWS

Why has the debt consolidation business begun to mushroom?

David Shanks, Financial Arrangers manager, said "It is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money, you will have a need for (debt consolidation) agencies."

His own firm, he said, has offices in various parts of the country and is opening new ones at the rate of two a month. National Budget claims 10 offices around the Nation. Abramson's Credit Advisors claim a national business of \$6 million paid out each year to creditors.

In Washington, National Budget claims 1,700 accounts, Credit Advisors more than 1,000 and Financial Arrangers 700 although it is just over 3 months old. Debt Help maintains about 300 active cases.

These totals indicate that debtors are increasingly attracted to the firms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be

laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. James Karkirk Woolnough, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 88th Congress, 1st session, a consular convention between the United States and Korea, which the President transmitted to the Senate today, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) consular convention with Korea, signed January 8, 1963.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1963.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Somali Republic;

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic;

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Malagasy Republic;

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Burundi;

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Jamaica;

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uganda; and

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

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

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

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

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

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

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

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

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

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

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic

and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

USE OF MH-30 ON TOBACCO

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for several years there has been agitation in some circles of the tobacco industry and within some areas of the Department of Agriculture to outlaw the use of MH-30, a chemical used to control suckers in tobacco. No evidence whatsoever to show that the use of the chemical MH-30 reduces the quality of tobacco has been offered. It is a substitute for hand labor, the expense of which would be at least \$50 to \$75 an acre. Furthermore, hand labor would not be available if this chemical were not used in connection with the production of tobacco.

Mr. President, I think the best evidence that the use of MH-30 is not harmful to the quality of tobacco is the fact that during the calendar year 1962, only 2.38 percent of Georgia's tobacco crop went into the loan. The marketplace is the best evidence of quality. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently promulgated new grade classifications for tobacco; and if there were any defect in the quality, these grade classifications, plus the marketplace, would show it up.

Mr. President, the general assembly of Georgia has passed a joint resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 188

Resolution opposing a move being made through official channels to require the identifying by tagging of tobacco treated with maleic hydrazide (MH-30)

Whereas the production of tobacco is a major source of livelihood for thousands of

farmers and modern methods of production are a necessity in the competition of our times; and

Whereas the use of chemicals and other modern aids are primarily the reasons for the high level of the American standard of living; and

Whereas the use of the chemical maleic hydrazide (MH-30) as a growth inhibitor for controlling suckers in tobacco is a necessity if the farmer is to compete under contemporary economic conditions; and

Whereas the tobacco manufacturers and exporters have given no valid scientific and/or medical reasons for outlawing the use of chemical MH-30 in tobacco production; and

Whereas during recent long and costly hearings called by the Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, and conducted for the States producing flue-cured and burley tobacco, no new evidence was brought out indicating that MH-30 was a causal agent harmful to smokers; and

Whereas despite these public hearings and despite a biased report on MH-30 by a U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency committee, the tobacco companies failed in their efforts to get a 50-percent discount rate on the 1963 tobacco crop; and

Whereas the latest attempt by the manufacturers and exporters to force their will on the tobacco growers by influencing through executive decree for identifying purposes the tagging of its tobacco treated with MH-30 and place the farmers completely at the mercy of the buyers; and

Whereas the fine cooperative spirit that has long existed between the farmer and buyer has been virtually destroyed by the aforementioned unscrupulous tactics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body condemn the subtle, insidious and secret methods attempted to discriminate against the tobacco farmers of the flue-cured and burley tobacco areas; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby invoke censure upon all of those responsible for the behind-the-scenes battle to arbitrarily impose their unjust scheme to achieve economic gain at the expense of the farmer; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby deplore the circumventing of democratic processes in this matter relating to the use of MH-30; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend, urge and request that congressional investigation be conducted immediately into all aspects of this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Senators and Representatives, the Governors and commissioners of agriculture of the States affected and to all companies purchasing tobacco in these tobacco belts.

In senate, read and adopted, March 5, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,

Secretary.

In house, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,

Clerk.

CUBAN DISCLOSURES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate on issues of foreign policy. It has never seemed to me that any reasonable concept of bipartisanship ruled out discussions—full and frank discussions—of such issues.

There is a distorted concept of bipartisanship which abhors Senate discussion. I am frank to say that it is

sometimes espoused by Democrats in a Democratic administration just as readily as it is sometimes espoused by Republicans in a Republican administration. Bipartisanship, in this distortion, suggests that if you have something nice to say about the way foreign policy is being conducted, say it; otherwise do not say anything.

I think the record will show that I have never subscribed to that concept of bipartisanship in any administration, Republican or Democratic. Nor do I subscribe to it now. Mr. Kennedy did not subscribe to it as a Senator; nor does he now as President of the United States.

Cuba or any issue of foreign policy which may be of concern to the American people is of concern to the Senate. Bipartisanship does not constrain silence in these matters in the Senate. On the contrary, it compels consideration. But the highest interest of the people does place the restraints of national responsibility—not Democratic, not Republican, but national responsibility—on all of us. We need to select our words with caution and speak them with care. It does not matter whether we call these restraints bipartisanship, patriotism, common national sense or whatever. What does matter is that we remain ever aware that the margin for error is close in critical foreign policy issues, and we cannot afford to fill it up with politics as usual.

I question the motives of no Senator who may raise the Cuban question. It would be wise, however, if each Senator who deigns to speak on this dangerous matter examined consciously and conscientiously his own motives. Each of us might well ask himself three questions: First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

I ask the Senate to ponder these questions. I ask each Senator to ponder them and his own silent responses to them, for these are questions which sooner or later each of us will have to answer to our own conscience, if not to our electorates.

I would ask all Senators to ponder the statement of the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg:

I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the Executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious because I respectfully submit, * * * only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by

some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the Executive.

If there is to be public criticism of policy, in short, let it be wise, dispassionate and constructive criticism. If the President's course is to be questioned, let reasonable alternatives be offered and let them be reasonably debated.

With that as background, Mr. President, let me say that I looked with favor on the revival of Senate discussion of the Cuban question some time ago. It seemed to me that in defusing the Soviet missile threat on the island—I would suggest that all of us, in the Senate and in the Nation, recall our feelings at that time—the President had also set the stage for useful Senate discussion of the Cuban situation. It seemed to me that wise and dispassionate consideration in the Senate would open up new thought and new ideas from which the President might benefit in discharging his grave responsibilities on behalf of all of us.

There has, indeed, been discussion of Cuba, but little of it has been dispassionate and even less of it has been constructive. What has evolved, instead, has been a trial of policy by press releases, with the size and sensationalism of the headlines which they produce serving as evidence, judge and jury. Some days ago I cautioned against the course this discussion was taking. I made a plea on the floor for consideration of the President's grave burdens. I did not argue against discussion. I argued for discussion couched in the restraints of reason, the restraints of high national interest. These restraints have not been visible. In my opinion, much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. It is not helping the President; it is hindering him. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba, but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and the perversion of fact.

I have been reluctant to reach this conclusion, for it reflects no credit on the Senate. Nevertheless, I am compelled to it by the recent discussion of the report that four American flyers lost their lives during the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

I did not wish to reveal the contents of the report which I am about to reveal, but I see no alternative. When the distinguished minority leader noted that he had just learned of the death of the four flyers, I was asked by the press to confirm it. I did so. I did not know why the distinguished minority leader raised the matter, but since it was raised by him—and he is a most responsible man—I saw no point in refusing to confirm the fact. I thought that would be an end to it, for I could not conceive of any earthly advantage to the Nation in a public delving in detail into this matter. And I could conceive of many, many disadvantages to the Nation.

But I was mistaken—very much mistaken—Mr. President, if I thought that would be an end to it. On the contrary, the matter has been pressed and pressed, and to what end? Are we going to get

closer to a solution of this critical problem of Cuba if we know every gruesome detail of the death of these unfortunate men, if we ascertain that 4, 8, or 16 Americans lost their lives in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs venture? Just what is it—what national purpose is served by this macabre fixation? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we take a dark and obscure function and throw so much light on how it operates that whatever value it may have for the security of this Nation is seriously compromised thereby? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we suggest—as this fixation does—that Cuban liberty can be bought with hired, well-paid American pilots, if only we hire enough and then not only hire them to fly but also give them a free hand to determine by their actions the course of U.S. policy? In this connection, I read from a UPI story of March 7, 1963—only yesterday:

When failure of the invasion appeared sure * * * one of the American pilots proposed a plan to bring the United States into the conflict. Aircraft with Cuban markings would strafe runways and drop a few bombs on areas inside the naval base at Guantanamo.

This is no secret. This is from the news files of the United Press International, March 7, 1963—in other words, on yesterday.

Is this the way those who are looking for political profit in this affair would have the life-and-death questions of the Nation decided? Or will they stop playing with fire and get behind the President, the one man, the only man, whom the American people, in their wisdom, have chosen to make the critical decisions?

No, Mr. President, I see no national purpose served by this discussion. But I do see others. Examine for a moment, Mr. President, the context in which the drums have been struck and struck again on this matter of the death of the flyers. Clearly, the impression was permitted to gain national and international credence—and if Senators do not believe it, they can read the front pages of any newspaper in the Nation—that the tragic news of the loss of these men was suppressed by the Kennedy administration. And if the Kennedy administration would suppress this information, how much more, indeed, might it not be hiding in the dark archives of the White House and the State Department?

I now read to the Senate, Mr. President, a report which I have obtained on what occurred:

Four Americans flying for anti-Castro forces apparently were killed during the ill-fated Cuban invasion when their cargo plane crashed in the Caribbean.

A spokesman for a Miami concern that had put the Cuban rebels in touch with the flyers said the four had been missing since about April 19 and are presumed to have perished.

The spokesman, Alex E. Carlson, a Miami Springs lawyer, said he represented the Double Check Corp., a concern that acted as a broker in locating flyers for Cubans attempting to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro.

Mr. Carlson identified the missing flyers as Riley W. Shamburger, the pilot; Thomas W.

Ray, copilot; Leo F. Baker, engineer; and Wade C. Gray, radioman, all residents of Birmingham.

That report, Mr. President corroborates the story which has recently been revealed to the press by Members of the Congress. It was this report which I have in my possession which more than anything else led me to confirm the story recently released with all the tense trapings of an uncovered skeleton in the closet of the Kennedy administration. Where did I get this report which I have just read, Mr. President? Did I copy it from those who have recently revealed it with such shocking impact? Did I ferret it out of the White House or the State Department? What is its classification? "Secret"? "Top Secret"? "Eyes only"?

I read the source, Mr. President: Dateline Birmingham, Ala., May 4—AP—from the New York Times, May 5, 1961—1961—page 11.

One year and 9 months ago, Mr. President, in the public press, we find the same story that is now being used as an uncovered secret to cast doubt on the veracity and honesty of the administration. This then is the great new revelation, the sensational new discovery, which set the tone for the revival of a great debate on Cuba, a news item which first appeared in the press a year and 9 months ago. Is this the sort of thing that helps the Nation? Is this the sort of thing that sheds light on a most difficult and complex and dangerous situation? Is this the sort of thing that represents a responsible contribution by a responsible opposition to the Nation's policies on which the security and good name of the Nation depend? Or is it a glaring example of irresponsible politics, of panic politics at its worst? That is a cruel thing, Mr. President, to do to the families of those who died, and it is a reckless thing to do to the conduct of foreign policy. It would seem to me that those who have sought to build this matter into a mountain of suspicion and distrust of the President owe an apology to Mr. Kennedy. But even more, they owe an apology to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, the CIA, under its Director, John A. McCone, performs a useful and necessary service for the people of the Nation. It has been very frank in attempting to put the facts before the Congress—in my opinion, too frank, considering the nature of its work. I think it is about time that those who directly or by innuendo charge that the administration is "managing the news" on Cuba acknowledge that these demands, if met, can only lead to a total compromising of the work of this Agency, an embarrassment not of the President but of the Nation. Perhaps that is not too large a price to pay for full information. Each Senator will have to make that equation for himself. But it seems to me that if full disclosure is what is desired, Senators might well consider drastically curtailing this function and this agency. For, in my opinion, the Nation will be done less harm by that course than by a public examination of each and every detail of these operations.

I say once more what has been said before, it would be best for those who

have a penchant to play CIA Chief, Secretary of State and Defense to turn their attention to the legislative chores which confront them, to the needs of the people of the United States. If we must be the sleuths, let us find the culprits in the state of the Nation's sluggish economy. Let us get on with a tax cut which will strengthen the financial position of millions of Americans. Let us take an honest look at the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans, and how it is operating in practice. Let us probe in depth the educational needs of the Nation and the health and hospitalization needs. Let us take a hard look at the strangulation and the decay of our cities. Let us penetrate in depth into the questions posed by automation and persistent unemployment now at a 6.1-percent figure.

These are matters of immense concern to the present and future of this Nation, no less serious than Cuba or any other problem of foreign policy. And it will take Senators and Representatives, not sleuths, to deal with them. It will take a hard wrestle with reality to face these facts and to devise public policies for dealing with them. The President has proposed. It is about time that this Congress began to dispose.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana still has no objection to dispassionate discussion of the Cuban situation on the floor of the Senate. However discouraging this political prowling over the dead may be, the Senator from Montana is still hopeful that reason will prevail in this body on Cuban policies and that this body will yet make the contribution which it can make. And so he welcomes the continuance of the discussion. But let me say again, if we are to call shots in this delicate arena as we see them, let us be reasonably certain that we have seen them before we call them. And if we are to try to move the cautious and deliberate policies of the President off the course of national peace, national security, and international decency, on which he has tried to set them, let us be sure of our intentions. If there are those who would continue with this reckless flaming of public emotions, let them at least acknowledge what they are about. This is not a child's game. It is not a TV thriller. To continue to toy with these questions as has been done in the recent past is to toy with the life of the Nation.

HARTKE URGES SUPPORT OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on my return from Africa last December, I urged through correspondence, Hon. Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, to consider the establishment of a Senior Peace Corps, comprised of retired businessmen who could devote some of their time to teaching their know-how to businessmen in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Everywhere I went in Africa, there was a desire for American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans. Also, they seem to be im-

pressed with the hard work that is a badge of most American businessmen.

I assumed that if this were true in Africa, it must be true in other underdeveloped countries, such as some of our neighbors to the south of us in Latin America and South America.

For several weeks now Secretary Hodges, his assistant, Dr. Jack N. Behrman, officials of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and I have discussed this most important project.

Recently the Agency for International Development announced that a pilot project, using the idea of a peace corps, comprised of senior or retired businessmen, could be created in Liberia and in Nigeria.

Dr. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps. A recent article in the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1963, by Mr. Robert Hochstein, contributing writer, covers some of these facts in a story headed "Business Peace Corps Wins Behrman Support," and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BUSINESS PEACE CORPS WINS BEHRMAN SUPPORT

(By Robert Hochstein)

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Jack N. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps.

Mr. Behrman said the idea to utilize the skills of retired businessmen overseas suggested by Senator HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, is an excellent one but that the initiative must come from the business community.

The Commerce Department official will get in touch with the businessmen on an informal basis. He said some businessmen have previously suggested their know-how be used in the manner proposed, but no one ever picked them up on the idea.

Mr. Behrman said costs for such a program should be on a shared basis between business and Government, but indicated the bulk of the financing should be by business.

PILOT PROJECT PROPOSED

Meanwhile, Senator HARTKE, who proposed the concept of a business peace corps, said he had been informed that the Agency for International Development would like to set up a pilot project in Liberia or Nigeria.

An AID spokesman said these countries have been suggested for two reasons.

Because the knowledge of English is widespread, barring any language problem for the retired businessmen; and because the private business sector is strong in both countries.

Mr. Behrman said if a business peace corps becomes a reality, it should not function on only one continent. He said many problems are inherent in such a program, "but the Peace Corps also had problems in the beginning."

Mr. Behrman has been in contact with the State Department, as well as AID, about the proposal.

Senator Hartke, a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, suggested the idea of a businessmen's peace corps to Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges in January after returning from a 5-week factfinding mission in Africa.

LACK CALLED APPALLING

"The absence of American participation in the business communities of Africa is appalling," he told Mr. Hodges.

The Senator said that since many skilled and knowledgeable businessmen are retired on pension, they would be able to serve abroad on modest salaries. The only other costs involved, he said, would be transportation.

Everywhere he went in Africa, Senator HARTKE said, there was a desire for American business methods which are admired by nearly all Africans.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I predict that Dr. Behrman will find the reaction good. I have received many, many letters from retired businessmen throughout the country supporting this proposal. Indicative of this support are some representative letters, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 24, 1963.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Congratulations on your idea of a peace corps of businessmen. I feel this proposal has merit and I hope it snowballs into something.

Gobs of money, doled out in the form of foreign aid, to so-called emerging nations does no good. With the help of experienced and successful businessmen, they could be taught to help themselves.

Thank you,

PAUL B. ATWOOD.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA,
January 14, 1963.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Re your recommendation as to utilization of retired businessmen makes real sense.

As a retired businessman, I feel that my ability as an executive in many lines of business in the wholesale jobbing field could be put to practical use.

I am 73 years old, married, no children, in good health; own my own home. Would move if the right opportunity presented itself.

I use a typewriter, but thought you would prefer to see my handwriting.

Let me hear from you.

Yours truly,

V. B. REISMAN.

IRWIN UNION BANK & TRUST CO. OF
COLUMBUS, IND.,
January 28, 1963.

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I am delighted to know that you have added my name to your mailing list.

Your idea on organizing retired businessmen and manufacturers to work with people in the underdeveloped countries, I think is indeed commendable. It certainly should bear fruit.

Sincerely,

S. E. LAUTHER,
President.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL,
Jamaica, N.Y., January 14, 1963.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on your plans for a businessmen's peace corps.

In Africa especially this is needed because the greatest weakness of colonial rule is the lack of administrators. America can and should supply a large share of this deficit and it cannot be adequately met by the young. As you know, you can't teach administration—it must be learned.

Wishing you success with your proposal, I am

Yours,

HUGH C. BROOKS, Ph. D.

ALBANY, GA.,
January 15, 1963.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GREETINGS: I read your article with deep interest in January 14, 1963, Newsweek. I was with U.S. Government (civil service) 1940 to few months ago when I retired on nice annuity. Other assignments consisted of auditing, time and study, policy and procedure, etc.; last assignment being comptroller of large air base here.

I have three children—all college graduates—one an attorney with his master's degree associated with solicitor here (Malone & Drake). Other son, a contractor, graduate from Georgia Tech, in his own business at Pensacola, Fla. The baby, Katherine, a schoolteacher at Pensacola, also.

I am also a World War I veteran and prior to 1940 I was in pecan business, three of us having promoted pecan sales and production from about 15 million pounds to about 100 million pounds yearly.

I like leadership and promotion, big deals and the businessmen's peace corps appeals to me and as my past was entirely supervisory and management, I feel on the ground floor I could build with you.

Sincerely,

JULIAN R. DRAKE.

All references you want: Senators RUSSELL, TALMADGE know me personally—especially DICK RUSSELL.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y., January 17, 1963.

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I have just read with great interest that you are planning to propose a businessmen's peace corps. The idea is most intriguing and deserves careful study. May I wish you much luck in its fulfillment.

You may be interested in reading the article on page 16 entitled "Operation Can Do" in the enclosed issue of County Government magazine, an official New York State publication. This article although it does not propose a peace corps of retired business executives, it does suggest a way whereby business and private enterprise can help the progress of less developed nations. Although your suggestion and the substance of the article are different, I feel that to a great extent the proposals are parallel.

I would be very grateful to be given the opportunity of hearing more of your proposal, and, if you have the time, to have your reactions on "Operation Can Do."

With kind regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

JAMES H. HEINEMAN,
Editor and Publisher.

SEATTLE, WASH., January 11, 1963.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: The attached news article published in the Seattle Times of January 6, 1963, was of interest to me since my wife and I had an opportunity to spend about 4 months in Africa (South Africa,

Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Kenya) in 1961. Our visit was sponsored by the cultural exchange program of the State Department and the South African Nature Union.

Although my activities in Africa related to other than business affairs our impressions were similar to yours, as expressed in this article. In my opinion your suggestion has considerable merit. No doubt you will also agree that opportunities for beneficial cooperative efforts of this kind extend to areas other than business and industry.

Our interest in Africa—its problems and opportunities—was greatly enhanced as a result of our visit. We have given some consideration to returning following my probable retirement in about 5 years if there is any likelihood of our making some contribution in my particular field. I am professor of forestry, College of Forestry of the University of Washington, and previously spent about 20 years as park naturalist with the U.S. National Park Service. Thus, my interest and abilities revolve about natural resource conservation with emphasis on recreational land planning and administration. It was our thought that upon my retirement we might associate ourselves in some manner with some sort of educational institution such as Makerere College in Entebbe, Uganda. Unless something unforeseen develops financial considerations would not be a dominant factor—the main idea being the satisfaction of contributing a bit toward better understanding as well as greater knowledge of American methods in my particular field of interest.

Current planned retirement age is 65 (my wife is about 8 years younger). My health and physical ability is and always has been good since my work over many years demanded considerable self-sufficiency and outdoor activity. If your suggested program meets with approval and can be expanded to include people with a background such as mine, I may contact you when my retirement plans become more definite.

Very truly yours,

C. FRANK BROCKMAN.

[From the Seattle Times, Jan. 6, 1963]

AFRICAN AID BY RETIRED MEN IS URGED

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Senator HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, recommended today that the Government send retired businessmen from this country to the emerging nations to advise their business leaders.

HARTKE made the suggestion in a statement and letter to Secretary of Commerce Hodges.

The Senator said a recent trip to Africa convinced him that leaders there need advice on business and production techniques.

"Everywhere I went there was a thirst for knowledge of American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans," he said.

In his letter, HARTKE added:

"Businessmen and industrialists * * * would have the chance to serve the cause of freedom and free enterprise. * * * They would contribute to the expansion of our own trade; develop a business community capable of increased world trade and increase the standards of living and purchasing power of their peoples."

SYRACUSE, N.Y., January 14, 1963.

Re Businessmen's Peace Corps.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading with keen interest your program relative to the businessmen's peace corps. As I am semiretired I should care to offer my services, gratis, relative to recruitment.

This being contacts with businessmen, groups, and organizations, and giving talks before such groups.

I am well acquainted with business groups throughout New York State, Pennsylvania, and eastern Ohio. Presently, my time is

devoted to presenting talks and writing speeches for business and professional men.

If you feel that I can be of any service to this project—I wish no salary—only my expenses—please advise me.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. MICHEL.

BERGDAHL, MCCARTHY, COURT ASSOCIATES,
New York, January 22, 1963.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Recently I read in Newsweek that you were intending to propose a businessmen's peace corps to be recruited for Government use in consulting and advisory capacities in foreign lands.

This writer is a retired executive with extensive experience and believes that your idea is an excellent one. Many retired executives would undoubtedly be glad to offer their services on the basis you have suggested if they felt they were really contributing something for the benefit of backward countries as well as for U.S.A.

The writer sincerely hopes that you will push this idea.

Yours very truly,

H. O. BERGDAHL.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in addition to the letters, there have been telephone messages and telegrams urging that such a program be initiated.

Each year, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States appropriates millions of dollars for foreign aid. Some of it, unfortunately, is not spent wisely; so that today there is in some quarters of our citizenry a hue and cry to stop all foreign aid. But our American businessmen, who have proved that their know-how can make them successful businessmen, are now free in retirement to impart their know-how to their foreign businessmen, so that they can begin to stand on their own feet and not rely on American foreign aid for assistance. I view this businessmen's peace corps as a project which could be rightfully termed "Operation Free Enterprise," an operation destined to bring to these new nations of the world the opportunity to develop, under their own system of government, a free business economy and one in which men can produce their products in a free economy—not a controlled economy.

This type of project is one more way that the tide of communism can be stemmed, and I urge my colleagues of this great deliberative body to lend support to this program and to work closely with Dr. Behrman and other Government officials to get these new nations moving forward under the free enterprise system.

MARYLAND MOVES TOWARD 17-YEAR-OLD SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO END HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers revealed that unemployment has reached the level of 6.1 percent, the highest level of unemployment we have suffered for a long time, more than a year. One of the reasons why unemployment is so high is that a very large number of young people are out of school and out of work. As a group these young people were the

most heavily unemployed of any age group. The problem of high school dropouts is a serious one throughout the Nation. This is why earlier this year, in January, I submitted a resolution calling on school authorities to use their influence to raise the mandatory school-leaving age to 17.

I am delighted that this morning I can announce that I have a letter from the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates, at Annapolis, who has informed me that as of the date of the letter, February 20, he was intending to introduce a bill to raise the mandatory school-attendance age to 17 in Maryland. I notice, on the basis of press reports, that the bill was introduced yesterday.

I am delighted to see progress being made. Although my resolution, submitted in January, has not had a hearing and has not been acted on yet, it appears it is having some influence. I commend the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me and my reply to Mr. Dillon be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MARCH 7, 1963.

HON. R. SAMUEL DILLON, JR.,
Chairman, House Education Committee,
House of Delegates, Annapolis, Md.

DEAR MR. DILLON: Many thanks for your thoughtful note.

I'm delighted that you and a large number of the house education committee will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

You deserve much credit for taking this step. You not only serve well the interests of the youngsters involved and their parents, but of your State and our Nation too.

The high school dropout and teenage unemployment problem is unquestionably one of our most serious. You are taking a long step toward correcting it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
Annapolis, Md., February 20, 1963.
The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you very much for the copy of your resolution requesting the States to raise the compulsory school attendance to age 17.

I, and probably a large number of the members of the house education committee, with the support of the Maryland State Department of Education, will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

With all best wishes, I am
Most sincerely,

R. SAMUEL DILLON, JR.,
Chairman, House Education Committee.

EXTRAVAGANCE AND WASTE IN STATUARY IN WASHINGTON

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier in this session I introduced a joint resolution supporting Secretary of the

Interior Udall's plea that we establish a commission to study proposals for memorializing distinguished statesmen. I pointed out that if we did not do something like this, Washington is going to become a jumbled and endless sea of statuary, without much relationship to esthetic values or planning. This joint resolution has been supported by a number of newspapers throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, supporting my resolution, and an article from the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, reporting my resolution, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star]

PROXMIRE AGAINST CLUTTERING CAPITAL

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has in effect joined forces with Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in an effort to discourage indiscriminating erection of statues and memorials in Washington. Udall made a preliminary sortie against promoters of Capital statuary soon after he joined President Kennedy's Cabinet. Without help from Congress his efforts undoubtedly will prove futile.

PROXMIRE's immediate target is a proposed \$39 million memorial to former President James Madison. The Senator called it a multimillion-dollar boondoggle and predicted that opposition to it would be denounced as an insult to a father of the Constitution and fourth President of the United States. He foresaw resentment by spokesmen for Virginia, Madison's birthplace.

PROXMIRE is taking a stand that others should support to get behind Udall in bringing some kind of order out of the chaos of Washington statuary and memorials. It is time that some kind of a critical organization, such as the Capital Parks Memorial Board, PROXMIRE proposes, be established to exercise some judgment over what is accepted for installation in the already cluttered Washington scene.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic,
Feb. 16, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S MONUMENTAL PROBLEM:

PROXMIRE ASKS CURE

(By Joe Fisher)

WASHINGTON.—Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has waded into a monumental problem. He wants to put a lid on Federal spending for massive memorials and monuments in the Nation's Capital.

PROXMIRE opened his campaign this week when he introduced a joint resolution to create a National Capital Parks Memorial Board. The board would evaluate all memorial proposals and recommend guidelines and policies to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

Already, there are 96 memorials on hand in the National Capital Parks System, and each session of Congress brings a rash of proposals for bigger and better monuments. In the 86th Congress (1959-60), at least 17 bills were introduced for memorial construction. In the 87th Congress, 8 memorial bills were offered.

PROXMIRE said it has become a custom to tag a revered American name to some unnecessary building or monument that leaves Congress with the dilemma of spending another \$30 to \$40 million for a monument, or failing to show due respect for the departed statesman.

"In such a clash, reverence for the departed statesman always clobbers economy," said PROXMIRE.

A case in point is the \$39 million James Madison Memorial. While the project has not yet won congressional approval, members of the Memorial Commission have been appointed. The memorial will cost \$15 million, but will be combined with a \$24 million underground annex to the Library of Congress.

PROXMIRE said the Madison Memorial was a "multimillion-dollar boondoggle." At the same time, he said "any opposition will be viewed as an affront to the father of the Constitution, and probably as a calculated insult to Virginia, President Madison's birthplace."

Aside from the dollars involved in memorial construction, there are other important considerations. Who is to say whether a particular memorial blends with the overall Washington plan? Where are the new memorials to be placed?

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission still is trying to come up with a design which will appeal to the National Fine Arts Commission. Representative JOHN H. KYLE, Republican, of Iowa, has proposed swapping the 10-acre site reserved for the \$30 million National Cultural Center for the 27-acre site set aside for the F.D.R. Memorial. As KYLE sees it, the site for the cultural center is "the worst in the Nation's Capital from almost every point of view."

One of the big objections to the F.D.R. Memorial is the design calling for eight slabs of assorted sizes set at odd angles to each other. The design certainly would be out of harmony with the nearby Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials. KYLE has suggested a Franklin D. Roosevelt festival hall as a substitute for a monument. Such a building, requiring adequate parking facilities, would be even less harmonious.

Washington is a beautiful city with broad streets and wide expanses of park land. The indiscriminate placement of memorials can do nothing but detract from that beauty.

PROXMIRE's proposal seems reasonable. Without some guidelines for memorial construction, Washington could become a city cluttered with stony statuary and, as PROXMIRE suggests, economy will be clobbered.

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 4, 1963, issue of the Dallas Times-Herald there appeared a compelling editorial entitled "The Right To Vote." The editorial rightly describes the sense of outrage Americans feel when their fellow Americans are denied the right to vote. It concludes with this reflection:

We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

Perhaps we can take further steps to remedy this situation during the 88th Congress, Mr. President. Certainly the support of newspapers such as the Dallas Times-Herald will help us to take these steps, just as the work of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, was instrumental while majority leader in securing the first Federal laws protecting voting rights in 80 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Mar. 4, 1963]

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The President's civil rights message deals in the main with a matter that should have been settled 100 years ago—the right of every American citizen to vote.

People have been shot in this country, not in 1863, but in 1963, because they believe the Constitution, because they think every amendment to the Constitution is basic to the whole document. One man was shot last week in Mississippi as he tried to help others obtain a place in the voting booth, a place so many of us take for granted.

President Kennedy is not asking the Congress to say who should associate with whom. The question is, do the rights guaranteed Americans in the Constitution apply to all citizens of the United States?

Congress can pass the laws that will make the answer an emphatic "yes."

States rights is not the question; it is individuals' rights. And the rights of an individual, guaranteed by the Constitution, should be of paramount concern.

The pity of the situation is not that the Federal Government is considering such legislation. The true concern should transcend even its passage. We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

OUTDOOR RECREATION—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader and the senior Senator from Minnesota worked out a unanimous-consent agreement relating to a vote on S. 20, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation.

There was an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock on Monday. However, some problems have arisen with respect to that agreement, and I would like now to modify the agreement, and, indeed, to offer a new unanimous-consent request, in the regular order of the unanimous-consent statement, that the Senate vote on the outdoor recreation bill, S. 20, Calendar No. 6, at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would mean that the time following the completion of morning business, whatever hour that might be, would be divided equally between the minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], whichever Senator was handling the bill at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserved my right to object only to say that this request is indicative of the fact that there will be a session on Monday, and that there will be an opportunity on Monday to discuss this question, which is highly controversial. Therefore, the vote will go over until 3 o'clock on Tuesday, and the time after the morn-

ing hour on Tuesday and before 3 o'clock will be equally divided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, I will move that the Senate adjourn until Monday. Therefore, there will be notice with respect to this unanimous-consent request. I ask action on the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous consent as previously agreed upon yesterday contained some other provisions. Is it the Senator's intention to eliminate those other provisions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator merely wishes to modify the order originally entered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that the vote be at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He wishes to modify the unanimous-consent agreement only in that respect. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not aware that there were other provisions in the unanimous-consent request agreed upon yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It also provided "that no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received." The Senator from Minnesota asks that the order be modified to substitute, instead of "Monday, March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of the routine morning business," the following: "Tuesday, March 12, 1963"; also, to change the hour of voting from 4 o'clock p.m. to 3 o'clock p.m. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 816, Calendar No. 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 816) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to express my support of the enactment of S. 816 to establish a Commission on Science and Technology.

The Senate has unanimously approved this legislation previously. It is not, therefore, necessary to reiterate the case for it in great detail.

In my view, a Hoover-type commission is an essential mechanism for taking an independent look at this vast problem: how to organize, or, if need be, reorganize, the U.S. Government so as to meet the formidable problems of science and technology in our time.

It is not enough that the executive branch can and does make studies of this nature on selected scientific issues. It is not enough that the President's Science Advisory Committee has made numerous important reports in the last 2 years, and that many distinguished panels are now at work.

These panels are chosen by the executive branch. They report to the executive branch. The report may or may not be released by the executive branch. I am not questioning the caliber of men who have been appointed to make these studies; they comprise many of the greatest scientific names in the land.

I am merely stressing the need for an independent "look-see"—to which the Congress has direct access and in which it, itself, participates.

I want to mention this, too, as regards the membership of these distinguished panels. There has been a feeling in some quarters that a sort of game of musical chairs goes on. Relatively small numbers of approximately the same numbers of able scientists are over and over again called upon by Government to appraise governmental programs. Many of them have formally served in Government. They invariably are men of outstanding caliber, but there is still concern in many quarters that the most candid and independent judgment may not always be obtained.

A so-called mixed commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission could secure independent judgment. It could review Federal policies on scientific manpower. It could look at the haphazard way in which certain scientific functions have evolved within some of the newer and older line agencies of the executive branch. It could look at the vital activities of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Many of us feel that the Academy-Council have not, for a variety of reasons, fulfilled a fraction of their potential usefulness to the U.S. Government.

I particularly invite attention to the fact that the Commission could take an important new look at the organization of the Federal Government for science information purposes. On pages 16 to 19 of Senate Report 16, I have personally presented a statement based upon my findings during work as chairman of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee. I point out, for example, on page 19, that an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion and disuniformity which still tends to characterize so much of the activity within the executive branch.

Many important information improvements have been made by individual agencies. An extremely important report has been prepared by the panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Information. There is, however, not the slightest reorganization or consolidation of Federal information services as yet in sight. There is not yet in sight any executive plan for a national network of information systems and services which this subcommittee has so long recommended.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will enact this Commission bill and I trust that our colleagues in the House of Representatives will approve it this time.

The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Operations, and it was previously unanimously reported on two or three other occasions. It has wide support.

It is a good measure. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is its main author, and has been for several years. The senior Senator from Minnesota held hearings on this subject. I hope the Senate will approve the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is other material in the report accompanying the bill, which might be explanatory and worthwhile, I respectfully suggest that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have marked in the committee report relating to the bill certain passages which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. I believe these statements make very clear the objectives and purposes of the bill.

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

ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS OF S. 816

DECLARATION OF POLICY

This bill proposes the creation of a Commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology. Section 1 of S. 816 declares it to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resource toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; and (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies with those of American business and industry and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

Section 1 also emphasizes the importance of formulating a program for the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government, through necessary reorganizations of existing departments and agencies which relate directly to Federal science, scientific research and technology, increased efficiency in establishing systems for perfecting a scientific information program, and for the improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower.

The bill includes, also, a special provision relating to, and assessing, the importance of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives for the advancement of science and technology in the legislative process, as recommended by witnesses appearing at the hearings on an identical bill in the 87th Congress, held on May 10 and July 24, 1962.

OBJECTIVES

Section 2 sets out precise objectives for which the Commission might direct its attention to include, among other areas of study, the following:

1. The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies

operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the objective of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

2. The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities, and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; and

3. The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower.

The Commission would be further authorized and directed under section 2 to make a determination as to the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations. The bill provides that, if such a Department of Science and Technology is deemed necessary, the Commission should, in so recommending, determine what existing functions or agencies should be transferred to the new Department, or to other departments, and which functions and operations, now performed by Federal departments and agencies, can more properly be performed by private industries or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

The Bureau of the Budget interposed objections to certain committee guidelines contained in section 2 of the previous bills to create a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology (S. 1581, 86th Cong., and S. 2771, 87th Cong.), on the premise that it might be construed as a directive to the proposed Commission to submit such a recommendation. The committee feels, however, that inasmuch as practically all witnesses, and numerous statements, articles, and extracts from publications and books which were inserted in the RECORD of the hearings, advanced or dealt at length (either for or against), with recommendations that a Cabinet officer for science and technology should or should not be appointed, the proposed legislation should contain a specific directive that the Commission determine whether such a department is necessary.

Some of the members of this committee have indicated that they were inclined to support the creation of such a department, but have been unable to recommend legislation to achieve this objective. There was no agreement among the expert witnesses who have testified as to what functions or agencies should be included in such a department, if it is established. All witnesses were in agreement that many of the scientific and technological functions of the Government should remain a part of the mission of existing departments, and that certain of those agencies established to perform functions in specialized areas of science, education, or research and development might operate better as independent agencies, or as presently constituted. None made specific proposals as to which agencies or functions should be included or which should continue to operate outside of such a department. Accordingly, the bill also directs that the Commission recommend, if it should determine that such a department is necessary, what functions and operations should be transferred to the new department, which should remain independent, or remain as an essential

component of existing departments as essential to the primary mission of the department in which they are presently located.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3 of the bill waives the application of conflict-of-interest statutes for members or employees of the Commission while serving on a part-time or full-time basis with or without compensation.

Section 4 provides that the Commission shall be composed of 12 members of whom (a) 4 are to be appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; (b) 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; and (c) 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

Sections 5 and 6 provide that the Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and that seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

Section 7 provides that Members of Congress and members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that now received, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of such duties, plus necessary expenses.

Section 8 authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required in accordance with provisions of the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949; and that the Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act, temporary and intermittent services at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals.

Under this section, the Commission would also be authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutes; to conduct such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary to discharge its duties; and that financing and administrative services may be provided to the Commission by the General Services Administration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

Section 9 provides that the Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members thereof while performing the duties of the Commission. The panel would consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry, and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to

communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

REPORTS, HEARINGS, AND TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

Section 10 requires that the Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress as it deems advisable, and that its final report shall be submitted to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

Sections 11, 12, and 13 authorize the Commission to hold hearings and take testimony as may be deemed advisable to secure required information and other data from executive departments or agencies upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman; the necessary appropriations; and that the Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report.

SIGNIFICANCE TO PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, I expressed the view that the shortcomings in science information which the subcommittee has brought to light represent one of the many important reasons for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, concluding as follows:

A Commission on Science and Technology could serve as an important instrument for the examination of problems relating to the processing of science information. Only an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion which continues to characterize the executive branch.

Experience indicates that no Federal agency is likely to take the initiative of recommending the reduction of its own size. Thus, none is likely to recommend the transfer even of those of its information functions which bear no inherent relationship to the agency's central mission. Yet, some inter-agency information functions can be consolidated in the interest of economy, efficiency, and service—and without the slightest impairment of individual agency missions.

No one claims that coordinating information is a cure-all for management ills; but few ills will be cured if information is too late, too disuniform, too fragmented, too hard to get, too unreliable.

Five years ago, the doubters looked askance when the Committee on Government Operations and this subcommittee claimed that the information explosion had precipitated an information crisis. Today, most of these doubters are quoting our very words. But today, the doubters deny that a reorganization of information services is necessary. I believe that the future will prove them just as wrong as has the past.

Mr. President, I also wish to include the following extracts from a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, when he introduced the bill in the Senate on February 18, 1963.

He said:

One of the basic objectives of the bill is to provide a medium through which individual Members and committees of the Congress can obtain information which is not now available to enable them to take appropriate legislative action to establish definite Federal policies in the field of science and technology. The reports and recommendations of the Commission will also provide a basis for an evaluation of programs which

are presently in operation as well as those which are being proposed.

Evidence was also submitted at the hearings on S. 2771 in the 87th Congress which indicated that the Bureau of the Budget has reported that a detailed evaluation of existing science and technological operations of the numerous agencies operating in these fields has been found to be too difficult. The result has been that the agencies interested in procuring appropriated funds are not required to submit an evaluation of achievement under existing programs, but merely attempt to justify further appropriations of funds. Under this procedure, it was pointed out that Congress is required to appropriate funds on faith alone, since the appropriate committees and individual Members of Congress have no information which would permit them to evaluate the programs or to take the necessary action to eliminate excessive duplication and waste.

Should the Congress enact this measure, it will be provided with a means of obtaining information and facts that will better enable it to perform its appropriate constitutional function. The Committee on Government Operations is firmly convinced that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study all of the science and technological programs of the Federal Government as proposed by this bill. It is further convinced that its enactment will insure maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, in the formulation of a properly coordinated program with the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry, nonprofit, and other technological institutions at a reduced cost.

The committee in recommending this legislation in past Congresses considered it to be an essential first step in achieving these objectives so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendation of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology upon which appropriate legislative action may be taken to promote more efficiency in the operation of these programs and to effect economies that are essential in conserving Federal funds and technological manpower.

In view of our current fiscal difficulties, I am sure all of my colleagues are sympathetic to any measures which seek a balanced budget. Nevertheless, our science and technological programs must not be hampered or neglected. I submit that this measure should result in material savings through a freer exchange of ideas and a better coordination between the various Federal agencies dealing with science and technology. It should eliminate much of the current duplication of effort. I, therefore, urge enactment of this measure during the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resource toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and

agencies with those of American business and industry, and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; (e) the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of Federal science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government through necessary reorganizations of departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, foundations, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government which relate directly to Federal science generally, scientific research, and technology; (f) insuring increased efficiency in establishing systems for acquiring, translating, storing, documenting, indexing, retrieving, and distributing scientific information through the establishment of the most modern systems of technology and automation; (g) improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower; and (h) assessment of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives in the legislative process.

OBJECTIVES

Sec. 2. To determine the action necessary for implementing this policy, the Congress hereby declares that immediate consideration should be given to studying the means for attaining the following objectives:

(1) The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the purpose of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions;

(3) The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower;

(4) The determination of the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing Government scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, in order to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations; and

(5) If the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology is found to be necessary, the determination of functions now exercised by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government which should be transferred to that or other departments and what, if any, new functions should be given to such departments, as well as those which more properly should be transferred to and performed by private industry or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

Sec. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bring-

ing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities;

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 6. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810),

but at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, to conduct such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary in order to discharge its duties.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) may be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46d) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members of the Commission while performing the duties of the Commission.

(b) The panel shall consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

(c) Any member of such panel who is a Government officer or employee shall receive no compensation for his services as such a member, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as such a member.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall determine means of attaining the objectives of this Act as stated in section 2.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress at such time or times as the Commission deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent estab-

lishment or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 13. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 10.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

FEDERAL COORDINATION IN DRUG POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 20 and 21, 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations will resume hearings on Federal drug policy.

As before, these hearings will examine interagency coordination in drug research and regulation.

We will explore administrative and scientific problems, primarily within the Food and Drug Administration, but also extending to the entire Federal scientific community, including the U.S. Public Health Service and other agencies.

The principal examination of Food and Drug Administration organization and policy will not come until next month, however. At that time, the committee will hear testimony from Federal agency officials, including Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze, and Commissioner George Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration.

By contrast, in our March hearings we will receive expert testimony from largely private witnesses on selected drug issues confronting Federal agencies and also of great consequence to the health of the American people.

The list of witnesses will be announced as soon as the final confirmations have been received.

The subcommittee has compiled a mass of scientific evidence and judgment—far more than our other commitments will permit us to cover orally during the presently scheduled hearings. Much of this additional material will be printed verbatim, as heretofore, in supplementary exhibit volumes.

REPORT ON ONE-FIFTH OF A MILLION DRUG ARTICLES YEARLY

Included are several factual compilations, prepared at our request by Federal agencies. One, to be released shortly, is an important survey, "The Nature and Magnitude of Drug Literature." This report was prepared by the National Library of Medicine. It estimates there are around 200,000 original professional

articles and papers in the world's pharmaceutical literature each year.

The report also briefly summarizes the extent of other printed outlets of the "drug explosion"—in the form of direct mail, detail men's brochures, as well as books, desk references, abstracting and indexing publications, and so forth.

RECENT PROGRESS PLAN FOR WHO SYSTEM

Since the subcommittee's hearings in August 1962, following the worldwide Thalidomide tragedy, certain important and favorable developments have occurred.

In some of these developments, observers have stated that the reorganization subcommittee has played a helpful role. For example, at this very time, experts convened by the World Health Organization are preparing recommendations for a formal, pioneering program in international exchange of drug information. This was a key goal of our past hearings and of subsequent subcommittee correspondence with governments and scientists throughout the world.

FDA NEEDED TIME FOR ACTION, REVIEW

In our own country, the past several months have afforded the Food and Drug Administration much-needed opportunity to propose new regulations under the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962 and to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the second Citizens' Advisory Committee on FDA.

The time is at hand to take stock of progress to date and to examine continuing problem areas.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Fortunately, the subcommittee now includes, in addition to all of its previous members, three additional distinguished and able members, including Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, former HEW Secretary, as well as Senators CLAIBORNE PELL and JAMES PEARSON.

INTEREST OF OTHER COMMITTEES

As before, the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee will study those phases of Federal drug policy appropriate to our jurisdiction of interagency coordination. Other committees of the Senate and House will be taking up problems pertinent to their respective fields. We have been happy to forward our past findings to each of them, including the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations.

In this period, the Food and Drug Administration will be presenting its case for the expanded 1964 fiscal year appropriations, recommended by the President.

Speaking personally, I feel confident that the expert Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare will examine the President's budget recommendations most sympathetically. I believe that the Congress is now well aware that FDA cannot possibly fulfill the enormous burdens which have been placed upon it, unless it is given more adequate resources.

But Federal drug actions involve more than levels of appropriations; they involve policy decisions and administrative and scientific implementation.

It is the subcommittee's task to submit to the Congress and the Nation the best judgment which can be mobilized from America's healing arts on these topics.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND RACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last year I introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 200) to establish a Century of Freedom Commission that would have provided nationwide coordination in developing and executing suitable plans to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. President Lincoln's historic proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863. Today it stands as one of the most significant actions ever taken by a President of the United States in the never-ending struggle for human freedom and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Emancipation Proclamation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION, JANUARY 1, 1863

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:—

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof respectively shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall in the absence of strong countervailing testimony be deemed conclusive evidence that such State and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:—

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, (including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are, and henceforth shall be, free; and that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons of suitable condition will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unfortunately Congress did not act on my Century of Freedom resolution to establish machinery to provide for appropriate commemoration of this important anniversary. Nevertheless a number of such events have already been held; others are planned for this year.

Today I would like to draw special attention to one such event of unusual importance, the National Conference on Religion and Race that was held in Chicago, January 15-17. The National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America sponsored this conference to explore the contemporary forms and effects of racial discrimination and segregation. This cooperative effort constituted an impressive demonstration of interfaith concern for this country's most urgent human problem.

This conference held on the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation did not dwell on the significant achievements of Negro citizens during the past century, or the progress that has been made in the quest for racial equality, but rather concentrated on the vast problems that still exist. The American dilemma described by Gunnar Myrdal still remains with its far-reaching impact on American life and society. An examination of these fundamental and unresolved questions of human dignity, equality, and justice constituted the principal work of the National Conference on Race and Religion.

The speeches and discussions exhibited a common realization that the time for mere words, ideas, and intentions had passed. The imperatives of the present situation could only be met

through dedicated, courageous, and sacrificial personal action and deeds. This theme characterized major addresses by such individuals as Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, Rev. Martin Luther King, Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Franklin H. Littell, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Rabbi Julius Mark, and J. Irwin Miller. Small working and discussion groups disclosed a similar determination. Concrete ideas for the improvements of race relations in this country were explored with unusual frankness and honesty.

Few participants coming to the conference brought the illusion that total solutions to such vast problems could emerge from 3 days of the most intense study and discussion. But lesser objectives were realistic and feasible, and the conference accomplished many of these. It brought the precise nature of the race problems in this country into sharper focus. It demonstrated that persons of all religious faiths actively seek the eventual resolution of these problems. It identified new channels and opportunities for such activity. It generated a feeling of commitment among the many religious faiths and denominations in attendance.

This commitment was given tangible form through the adoption of "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People" by the conference delegates. This moving statement by persons representing all principal religious faiths is an action without parallel in the social and religious life of this country.

This appeal condemns no section of the United States. It admits that the churches themselves have often evaded and rejected their responsibilities. It recognizes that progress has been achieved in certain areas; but it asserts that far more remains to be accomplished. It closes with a call to every American to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while the opportunity for such action remains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this historic affirmation, "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(From the National Conference on Religion and Race, January 17, 1963, Chicago, Ill.)

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

I

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,"

slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—North and South, East and West. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We Americans of all religious faiths have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this:

Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshipped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the conference provided for local follow-up committees throughout the country. Groups have already been established in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland. Other local committees will be formed when administrative funds become available. Moreover, the secretariat of the conference

will continue to function for a period of time in order to transmit the work of the conference to these local groups.

Two excellent articles describing the work of the National Conference on Religion and Race also have been brought to my attention. One appeared in *Christianity and Crisis*, the outstanding journal founded by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and his associates at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. The other report appeared in the respected weekly journal, the *Christian Century*. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the *Minneapolis Star* relating to this conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From *Christianity and Crisis*, Feb. 4, 1963]

SPECIAL REPORT ON RELIGION AND RACE

(By Stephen C. Rose)

CHICAGO, ILL.—Which biblical prophet is more relevant to the American dilemma, Amos or Jeremiah? I found myself forced to this question in attempting to understand the significance of the National Conference on Religion and Race, held in Chicago, January 14-17, on the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Both Amos and Jeremiah predicted the worst for Israel, but they differed in their estimate of Israel's capacity to extricate herself from national sin. Amos proclaimed the devastating lion's roar but suggested that man could turn from evil to good. Two centuries after the prosperous time of Amos, Jeremiah surveyed the wreckage of Israel and concluded that his nation was incapable of repentance.

Israel, in the person of the three major faiths, met in the land of Lincoln to bewail the national sin of race—the publicists ascribed a positive significance to this being the first such meeting—and to propose solutions to the problem. On the very first day the issue was drawn.

Jeremiah's mantle was donned by New York Attorney William Stringfellow who told the 600 delegates that the conference was, in his opinion, "too little, too late, and too lily white." A Jewish delegate arose to condemn the prospect of "4 days of breast beating and self-flagellation." And Rabbi Abraham Heschel, the keynote speaker, responded to Stringfellow by saying, "The greatest heresy is despair of man's power to goodness."

It was this latter note that dominated the conference and was reflected in the unanimously approved "Appeal to Conscience." History will determine whether this modern Israel—the American religious establishment—was, in fact, able to repent.

There was some substance to the allegation that the conference was too lily white. Only 1 of the 11 major addresses was given by a Negro, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King's speech came on the last day when major deliberations had been completed.

Although there were many Negroes present, certain significant groups did not attend: The National Baptist Convention refused the invitation of the conveners. CORE and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee were not invited because they were not considered religious organizations. Perhaps the Black Muslims should have been represented, either in person or through a presentation of the threat that they offer to advocates of peaceful change.

Nevertheless the conference did bring together top representatives of 70 religious organizations in a determined effort to speak out in unequivocal terms against the sin of race. The 4-day session ended with a question common to many religious meetings: How are insights to be translated into action?

To some extent the conference was organized to answer this question. Although speeches were numerous, major emphasis was placed on hours of deliberation in small work groups, designed for frank discussion and the formulation of specific proposals. Although the conference was not organized with the authority to promulgate and implement specific policies, numerous suggestions were offered in the hope that they would provide a solid foundation for witness in specific situations.

Among them were the following: Whites should seek membership in Negro congregations and vice versa; the formation of small, direct action groups of laymen to meet problems; solicitation of open-occupancy pledges and sponsorship of voter-education drives; unequivocal preaching; rejection of offers of free land for church construction from promoters of segregated developments; elimination of discrimination in hiring qualified Negro employees in schools, hospitals, etc., operated by religious institutions; use of pension funds and other investments as weapons in the racial struggle by withholding investments from institutions that practice discrimination and consciously investing in Negro banks in order to increase available mortgage funds and integrated housing developments; purchasing only from companies with nondiscriminatory employment clauses; encourage members who are teachers to work in ghetto area schools; spark revision of textbooks that give an outmoded picture of the Negro; begin a "justice corps" of young people to augment the direct-action approach of the student nonviolent movement and CORE; encourage similar interfaith meetings on a local level.

These proposals are not new. But it was hoped that the setting of the meeting, the expressions of cooperation on the race issue by the major faiths and unanimous commitment of the "Appeal to Conscience" would operate to give impetus to a new effort by the religious establishment to speed the end of racism in America.

The 3-page "Appeal to Conscience of the American People" was approved with full awareness of the potential hypocrisy of another religious pronouncement. It embodies both repentance—"With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent"—and a call to obedience—"Seek a reign of courage in which * * * men willingly suffer for justice; in which church and synagogues lead, not follow."

On paper, at least, the three faiths have now stated together what each has said separately in the past. The appeal also endorses the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans as an evidence of greater wisdom and courage in our national life.

The ecumenical significance of the meeting is difficult to determine. It was suggested more than once that such a meeting—involving intimate conversation and mutual policy-making—could not have taken place during the pre-Vatican II era, and there is little question that the spirit of Pope John XXIII increased its ecumenical spirit. A clearer indication of the ecumenical trends will be given when the effect of the conference on a local level is known.

In preparation for the conference, pilot interfaith groups to deal with the race problem were formed in several cities, and it is hoped that such efforts will increase. The conference secretariat will continue for four months, primarily to disseminate insights to the local level. A permanent steering com-

mittee has been formed to forward the work of the conference and determine the need for future efforts on a national level.

The addresses were generally of high quality. Speaking for the Government, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver (whose journey to Chicago was regarded by the press in a political rather than religious context) minced few words: "The Government," he said, "looks to the religious community for its share of the task and encounters, too often, a bland philosophy of *laissez faire*."

In an excellent discussion of religion and race in its historical perspective, Prof. Franklin Littell observed, "Racism has the same meaning where found among American Protestant churches as have the bitter anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism which so frequently accompany it. They mark and mar a religion which has lost faith in the author of history, which is anxiously striving to retain old ways rather than retool to meet the challenges of the new age."

Another thrust at the conference was a largely unexpressed undercurrent; namely, that the time may come when the white community in America (and those elements of the Negro community that make their livelihood in white-sponsored race relations work) will no longer be able to take the initiative in the racial crisis. The shadow of Malcolm X was not absent from the corridors of the Edgewater Beach Hotel, and one suspects that subconscious fear was among the motivations of the assembled delegates.

In the wake of a potentially significant conference, filled with prophetic utterances and declarations, the Amos-Jeremiah dichotomy remains. Has the judgment been passed? Is it too late to achieve the American dream to which Martin Luther King referred so eloquently?

The tension between optimism and pessimism about religion's role in the solution of the racial dilemma remains with me, because at moments it actually seemed that the tremendous force represented by the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish communities might finally rise up and reverse the years of apathy and neglect. For a moment it seemed that the delegates might become evangelists of justice armed with the insight of James Baldwin's remark, "It's not a matter of acceptance or tolerance. We've got to sit down and rebuild this house." Only on the basis of such a radical response—rooted finally in the mystery of God's action in history—will the conference attain its high purpose.

[From the *Christian Century*, Jan. 30, 1963]

RELIGION AND RACE (By Kyle Haselden)

One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation the religious organizations in the United States finally came together in one body to discuss the moral problem of racial discrimination and segregation in specific and concrete terms. Six hundred fifty delegates from 70 religious groups met in the first National Conference on Religion and Race at the Edgewater Beach hotel, Chicago, January 14-17. This interreligious conference, the first of its kind in the Nation's history, was convened by the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America. The conference thus had the approval and support of the highest representative officers of the participating bodies. In addition to the delegates, several hundred observers and visitors attended the open sessions.

In the depth of the planning for the conference, the efficiency of its machinery, the comfort and conveniences of the housing provided for it, the mood of congeniality and cooperativeness which pervaded it, the ear-

nestness of the delegates in grasping the problems which called them together, the auspices under which it met—in all of this the National Conference on Religion and Race was extraordinarily successful. But the tests of the true success of this gathering run deeper.

Whatever the values of the conference in the solution of the racial problem, it made a deep and far-reaching contribution to the solution of the interfaith problem. This was the most cosmopolitan gathering of religious leaders under religious auspices in American history. What Will D. Campbell said and William Stringfellow and others implied was in some measure accomplished: it is more realistic to seek a true inner life for church and synagogue through the race problem than to seek a solution to the race problem through the inner life of church and synagogue. The Nation's No. 1 domestic problem called together and introduced to each other people who on religious grounds have long been estranged. What else could have put in one room representatives of the American Ethical Union, the Christian life commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, the Polish National Catholic Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Unitarian Universalist Association, the National Council of Catholic Men?

If a family so big is to gather in peace in one room, it has to be a room big enough to hold all its members. Particularities had to be submerged; generalities had to be avoided and the greatest common denominators sought. The harmony and the mutual dedications which were achieved were paid for in patience, restraint, understanding, courtesy, and a willingness not to say everything that could be said. It was an open conference, but the delegates operated on the healthful Pauline principle that though all things are lawful, not all are expedient. Brought together by a great cause, the delegates stayed together and arrived at mutual dedications despite the theological chasms dividing them.

But was it a successful conference on race? No, if it is supposed that such gatherings solve problems. Yes, if it is assumed that the meeting of minds and hearts on a vast and grave human problem is a beginning rather than an ending. Such conferences do not solve problems; they discover problems. They lift up the unresolved issues, identify the unused talent and resources, dramatize the unfinished business, renew the faltering commitments. In these respects the National Conference on Religion and Race was successful not only in the interfaith but also in the interracial quest. Two, three, five years from now will be soon enough to ask what good came of it.

From the brilliant, scholarly opening address by Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel to the moving plea of Martin Luther King, Jr., at the close the accent was on action. In the plenary addresses by Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, J. Irwin Miller, Rabbi Julius Mark, Franklin H. Littell, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., in the forums and work groups the accent was on action. Who, indeed, can say anything more than has been said? Who can resolve anything more than has been resolved? The conference declared explicitly and implicitly that what is lacking in human relations is not ideas, instructions, resolutions, but deeds—deeds such as picket lines, sit-ins, freedom rides; the less dramatic but equally creative deeds of love and justice in our homes, our neighborhoods, our churches and synagogues, our public and private facilities; the personal deeds of prayer, faithful obedience, courageous individual witness to the will of the God who set the solitary in families and made all men one.

Provision was made for a followup committee and, temporarily, for a continuing sec-

retariat to put the resources of the conference at the disposal of local groups which want to transform words, ideas, and plans into action. The life of the secretariat, without which the accumulated values and resources of the conference will be inadequately used, will depend on the availability of funds for its support. But this is not the action the delegates had in mind; it is merely a means to such action. Already 10 follow-up local committees have been or are being formed—in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland.

What were the complaints about the conference? It was said, largely unjustly, that Negroes were not adequately represented on the program and in the number of delegates. There is a measure of truth in the first part of this criticism. President Benjamin E. Mays, of Morehouse College, Atlanta, was chairman of the conference. With the exception of him and Martin Luther King, Jr., the talent and insight of the Negro were neglected. But it is incorrect to say that Negroes were not proportionately represented. All the religious groups in the Negro community were invited to send delegates. Although some of the groups did not accept the invitation, roughly one-fourth of the delegates were Negroes. Since delegates were selected on a religious rather than a racial basis, the Negro contingency was disproportionately large.

There were more serious omissions. A conference on religion and race should not—as this one did—ignore the Indian and other minority racial groupings. It would have been fitting to have paid some attention to the plight of Spanish Americans in the United States. Although most Spanish Americans are identified as Caucasians, their speech and physical traits subject them to the same kind of oppressions suffered by Negroes in American society. But even more serious was the failure to give recognition, credit, and responsibility to women. With the exception of Mahalia Jackson, who sang, and the Reverend May Yoho Ward, who gave an invocation, no woman appeared anywhere on the program. Yet the fact, which some of the delegates and participating groups seemed not to realize, is that the women of the United States have been far in advance of men in the field of interracial activity. This was a regrettable oversight, but fortunately it will not halt the courageous, far-sighted services of women and women's organizations.

The conference, tied to the nationwide celebration of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, was the brain child of a young Roman Catholic layman, Mathew Ahmann of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, who deserves immense credit for the quiet, efficient work which brought this meeting to fruition. With the cooperation of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee, and J. Oscar Lee, executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, he initiated, planned, and directed the development of this historic gathering. He placed himself—and often the religious group to which he belongs—in the background and brought off without bitterness, rancor, or envy on the part of anyone an interreligious gathering which may prove to be epochal.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 17, 1963]

THE CHURCHES AND RACE

The National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago found R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., appealing to churches and synagogues to "bury religious laissez faire in racial problems." The need, the Peace Corps Director said, is for social action programs which will

produce concrete gains. Such programs could end segregation in churches where it now exists, Shriver suggested, and "introduce Negroes to every social and community event which the church sponsors or participates in."

It is difficult to generalize about the role of the churches in combatting the evils of discrimination. Even in the Deep South, where strictly segregated congregations are the rule, there is a wide range of opinion among laymen as to the morality of discrimination and many religious leaders have spoken out courageously against it.

But we think it will be generally agreed that even in the North, the example set by such leaders often does not reach deeply enough into congregations. As Shriver suggests, the example is frequently not translated into social action on behalf of basic principles.

It has been our impression, one sustained by inquiry, that Minneapolis churches and synagogues are generally outstanding in their dedicated work on behalf of these principles. The part played by various religious groups in combatting residential segregation and their efforts to educate the citizen to his responsibilities under Minnesota's newly effective Fair Housing Act, clearly suggests the presence of a powerful leaven of conscience which does not stop short of action.

We do not mean to imply that much more could not be done by these groups or by the congregations which they represent. But the picture often drawn of a spiritual leadership reluctant to war on discrimination, and of a lay leadership indifferent to inequalities of racial opportunity does not, in our opinion, apply to this community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Conference on Religion and Race was a most relevant expression of the same concern for human values that prompted President Lincoln to promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation. I commend the persons responsible for conceiving and organizing this interreligious conference of historic significance.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was conducting an executive hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee. In consequence, I was late in getting to the floor, and therefore did not hear the statement made by the majority leader with respect to a continuing discussion of certain problems relating to Cuba. He was kind enough to let me see the manuscript of his remarks. I believe it is appropriate that I make at least this one comment.

I was curious, when, 20 months after the Bay of Pigs incident, and after it had lain dormant all that time, the Attorney General should see fit to bring the matter out on the front page of the newspapers. I was curious as to the reason and why, after it had languished for 20 months, new life was being breathed into what was, at the time it happened, a controversy.

I have an interest only in the truth. It was written on the ancient parchment, long ago:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

I think that is good gospel and that is good philosophy and that is sound doctrine for government.

It was in pursuance of that doctrine that I laid the matter before the policy committee of my own party and asked whether they thought it ought to be explored and whether a further report should be made on it. I have been exploring it, although it has not been necessary for me to energetically explore it, because it has explored itself from time to time. The letters, telephone calls, and telegrams and other material which have come to me bearing upon the matter indicate that there is a high degree of public interest in this subject. I have been exceedingly circumspect in anything I have said with respect thereto. I have sought under no circumstances to prejudge the matter. I leave that to take place after an appropriate committee of the Senate, where both parties have representation may, after an evaluation of the testimony, has come to a conclusion, and when one can ask any member of the newspaper fraternity. That is as much as anyone has received from the minority leader on this point.

It was only when a distinguished Member of the Senate, on a television performance, indicated that it was "spilled milk" that I, perhaps inadvertently, mentioned that spilled milk is one thing, but spilled blood is quite another. When he said, "What do you mean by spilled blood?" I said, "Well, I simply mean that perhaps Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operation, and you don't lightly cast aside spilled American blood."

I left it right there. But they worked their own will. They worked their own thinking upon that little morsel. May it be said to the everlasting commendation of the majority leader that he did then state on the floor of the Senate or in a press conference that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs.

I asked nobody for confirmation. I was no party to any conference or any session, at the White House or elsewhere, where such a disclosure was made. But the majority leader stated, so that all the world could note, that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Of course, it is no wonder that this disclosure has seized upon the imagination of our people. It is small wonder that it has intrigued the interest of the press. So people continue to conjecture: What was the truth? What is the truth? What did happen? That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not like to see a gap in contemporary history that may someday be referred to as the Bay of Pigs gap.

If there is any merit in the old expression, it would have merit now; that is, that open confession is good for the soul. So why not lay all the facts upon the record and let us have done with it? Then the whole truth shall have been told, and our people shall have been satisfied on that point. If there are other questions appertaining to Cuba which need discussion, they can be raised when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the question, will finally make his report.

So, Mr. President, for myself, I must insist that my own approach to the matter has been most circumspect. I have at no time and under no circumstance undertaken to prejudge the matter. I leave it right there until such time as an appropriate group or subgroup of this body can go into the subject further.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very sorry to read in the morning newspapers that the Republican leadership has announced its determination to fight the bill which is now before the Senate—S. 20. I think it would be well for the Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, to understand the background and origin of S. 20 and exactly what it seeks to do.

Public Law 85-470 of the 85th Congress, signed by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 28, 1958, created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Commission was composed of four Senators and four Representatives, equally divided between the two political parties, plus seven public members appointed by President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower appointed as the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, of New York. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and I served on the Commission. Republican Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and WATKINS, of Utah, served on it for a time. They were succeeded by Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Thomas Martin, of Iowa. Senator Martin was succeeded by Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa.

In 1961, when President Kennedy took office, Senator ANDERSON asked him to retain the Commission as it was constituted, even though it was predominantly Republican. This was done.

The Commission reported on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, including many detailed research projects. The Commission found—and I wish to emphasize that the findings were unanimous:

The [recreation] demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to the Federal and State recreation areas, fishing license holders, the number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come.

Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with.

Recreation "activity occasions" ran 4.4 billion in 1960. It is estimated that by 1976 they will run 6.9 billion. They will be more than 12.4 billion—tripled—by 2000. These calculations are based on extensive studies, including a poll of 16,000 persons by Census Bureau for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report continues:

After 3 years of research, and an aggregate of some 50 days of discussion among the

Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought differing political, social, and resource-use opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of the individual members developed, and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

Here on the very first page of the report are the personal signatures of every one of the 15 members—proof of their individual agreement to the statement and to the fact that the report was the unanimous consensus of all of us.

I invite the attention of Senators to the names of members of the Commission who signed the report, which is the basis for the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

The Chairman was Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, N.Y.

From the U.S. Senate: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson; and Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

From the House of Representatives, Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; former Representative Gracie Pfof, of Idaho; Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; and Representative John H. Kyl, of Iowa.

The Presidential Commissioners appointed—and I again emphasize that they were appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—were:

Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, associate director of special activities, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

Bernard L. Orrell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.

Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

M. Frederik Smith, vice president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

Chester S. Wilson, former Minnesota State Commissioner of Conservation, Stillwater, Minn.

All these individuals were appointed by President Eisenhower, with the exception of Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, who was appointed by President Kennedy in, I believe, 1961 by reason of the death of one of the members.

Mr. President, the names to which I have just now referred give the background and parentage of the recommendations which are before us. Certainly this group is composed of distinguished Americans who have been appointed without regard to party. The entire burden of the effort of the Commission was to do an effective, nonpartisan job, so that we could get a report which would result in general agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator

from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Washington for yielding to me.

I wish to say that I think the Commission, which was appointed by President Eisenhower without regard to party, was an excellent one, and made an excellent report to the present administration.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that the extremely important recreation industry and its development and expansion will not become involved in any way in party politics. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted, indeed, to let that happen.

Recreation is one of the most rapidly growing industries in the United States today, and it shows signs of growing in the future at an even more rapid rate.

With the development of technology and assembly-line production, it has become possible for our industrialists to turn out the same amount of equipment of all kinds with much less labor than the amount previously required. Now we must find some way to take up the slack in employment which automation is creating; and the recreation industry lies immediately before us, waiting to be developed to several times its present size. That is particularly true in the part of the country which I represent.

Not only would the recreation industry take up the slack in employment, insofar as operating recreational areas goes, but in recent years there has been developed in the recreation field a demand for much new equipment which was not even on the market a few years ago; and this demand creates new industries and new employment in them.

The recreation industry has created a great new field for investment in this country. Even in our small State of Vermont we see millions of dollars of new money being put into recreation areas annually and thus creating new markets for recreational articles and new jobs for persons who otherwise perhaps would be unemployed. All of this, Mr. President, contributes to the taxable income of the country. I know small towns in my State which 10 or 20 years ago contributed virtually no taxes to the State, but now make very substantial tax contributions, not only on the property there and not only through the employment taxes on those who work in these areas, but also through the tobacco taxes, the gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes. If that tax income were to be lost, its loss could spell disaster to the economy of the State.

In addition, Mr. President, we must consider the agricultural situation of the country. In that connection, in order to keep in economic competition, farmers have had to change their way of doing business. They have had to double or treble the size of their farms, and they have had to purchase new machinery. All this has meant that thousands of small, uneconomic farms have had to be taken out of production. Then how were the small farms used? They were used as residential property; and more

particularly, they now contribute to the recreation industry, for today there is a great demand for living accommodations for people who wish to come for a week or a month, or even to live there indefinitely.

In one ski area in Vermont, the manager of the operations told me that presently there is a shortage of 2,500 beds in that one area, and that 2,500 additional beds are needed in order to take care of those who wish to come from other parts of the Nation to visit or live there.

Mr. President, if we were to restrict this development in any way, if we were to turn down cold the recommendations which this Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, has made, we would literally be taking the bread out of the mouths of our people, and possibly the recovery from the economic shock and loss caused by such action would not occur during this generation.

So I wish to support the Senator from Washington, and to state that I hope there will be no partisan position on this legislation or on legislation of this type. I hope we shall—as we did last year—enact this bill unanimously, so there could be no question about where we stand, and so that no one could charge any of us with obstructing the development of what is possibly one of the most rapidly growing industries in the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. As usual, he has approached this problem—as he has approached so many other problems—in a statesmanlike way.

It would be most unfortunate if this matter were to become a subject of bitter partisanship. Actually, Mr. President, if the objective is economy and saving money, then the implementation of this proposal, by both the Federal Government and the States, will be a way to achieve it. It will avoid a waste, both of human and of material resources. The States are undertaking all sorts of programs in this area; and those programs need to be coordinated with the programs of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity through S. 20 to utilize the resources of the Federal Government, and also those of the States, to carry out a long-range, coordinated program to deal with problems arising out of what has been so commonly referred to as the great population explosion.

As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, many great problems which are arising socially, economically, and politically as a result of our rapidly changing industrial technology. Our need is to find proper areas for recreation, not only for the youth of the country, but also for our older citizens. This bill—S. 20—is part of a desire on the part of all citizens—Republicans and Democrats alike—to meet sensibly this great demand which faces us.

This is not a wild-eyed program. I do not think Laurance Rockefeller and other businessmen on the Commission would jump off the deep end with a pro-

gram which would hurt the economy of the Nation. This is a realistic program.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out that a number of industries in our country have been growing and flourishing—in fact, they are called growth industries—because they are oriented toward the recreational needs and requirements of our people. Recreation is giving employment and new opportunities for business and for working men and women throughout America. I wish to commend the Senator for the point that he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking not only for myself personally, but I am also speaking for my State, which supports the bill (S. 20) and the subsequent bill (S. 859) which was introduced by the Senator from Washington, and upon which hearings are now being held. The State Director of Forests and Parks for Vermont had intended to testify in favor of that proposed legislation before the Interior Committee, but unfortunately we had too much snow, sleet, and rain, so that the planes did not fly and he did not get here. But he has sent me his testimony, which I have asked to have inserted in the record of the hearings. So I wish it understood that I am speaking not only for myself alone—although I believe everything that I have said—but I am also representing the position of my State.

Mr. JACKSON. We appreciate that. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators that the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan bill. It is supported not only by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Washington, but also the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], as well. We hope that the whole problem can be approached from that point of view. If we fail to do so, I think we will be rendering a great disservice to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some of the recommendations made by the Commission.

The Commission made extensive and very detailed recommendations to meet the tremendously expanded recreation demand which is ahead.

They recommended not only a national recreation policy—by unanimous consensus of all the members—but also many specific steps which should be taken to implement that policy.

The national recreation policy unanimously recommended on page 6 of the report before me states:

It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.

Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of Government and private enterprise. In some aspects, the Government responsibility is greater; in others, private initiative is better equipped to do the job.

The role of the Federal Government should be:

1. Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.
2. Management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreation benefit consistent with other essential uses.
3. Cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance.
4. Promotion of interstate arrangements, including Federal participation where necessary.
5. Assumption of vigorous, cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreation effort.

To implement this policy, the Commission recommended, among many others, the following specific steps:

It recommended that we set up and adopt a national classification system for outdoor recreation areas, to facilitate understanding, planning and management.

It recommended that every State develop a statewide recreation plan.

It recommended systematic and continuing research, both fundamental and applied, to provide the basis for sound planning and decisions.

At page 9 of the voluminous report it recommended as follows:

A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau would have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demand for outdoor recreation.

Specifically, the new Bureau would—

1. Coordinate the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies whose activities affect outdoor recreation.
2. Assist State and local governments with technical aid in planning and administration, including the development of standards for personnel, procedures, and operations.
3. Administer a grants-in-aid program to States for planning and for development and acquisition of needed areas.
4. Act as a clearinghouse for information and guide, stimulate, and sponsor research as needed.
5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation, including Federal participation where necessary.

WHAT S. 20 WOULD DO

The Secretary of the Interior established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on April 2, 1962, in response to the report, issued January 31, 1962.

In other words, Secretary of the Interior Udall carried out the specific recommendations of the unanimous report of a bipartisan commission headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

The Bureau will do exactly what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

Secretary of the Interior Udall transferred planning and State cooperation functions to it from National Park Service—duties imposed on that Service, as we all know, under the act of June 23, 1936. These functions were transferred

and placed in the new Bureau. Secretary Udall did not have the other powers and authorities, as recommended by the Commission, to transfer to the new Bureau. So Congress has been asked to provide the authorities. The bill (S. 20) now before the Senate would direct and authorize the Secretary, through the Bureau, to first, maintain an inventory; second, prepare a system of classification of types of recreation areas; third, develop a nationwide plan, built on State plans; fourth, provide technical assistance as ORRRC proposed; fifth, encourage interstate and regional cooperation; sixth, sponsor, conduct, and assist in research; and seventh, encourage Federal departments and agencies to cooperate.

Incidentally, I might comment here that, the wonderful cooperation that now exists between Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to be most highly commended. They appeared jointly before the committee yesterday to testify together in support of other proposed legislation in this same general field.

Eighth, to encourage donations to the cause—money, lands, and other property that may be of help.

BUREAU IN EXISTENCE

The next point I wish to make is that the Bureau is in existence. Last year \$1.1 million was transferred to it from the Park Service budget. In other words, the funds that the Park Service had for the functions that I have mentioned were transferred to the new Bureau. In the 1964 budget, which is now before the Congress, the request is for \$2.2 million. What I desire to emphasize is that this will be a small bureau, a service organization, and not a land-management agency. The director, Dr. Crafts, has testified that, as far as he can see, at the very outside the budget will never go beyond \$5 million. It will probably be considerably less than that, as a matter of fact at the peak.

There is no money authorization in the bill, because the Bureau is already in existence; and is a budgeted agency.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the fact that this will be a sound, sensible, first step toward carrying out the unanimous recommendations of a very able commission, a commission which has approached the problem without regard to partisanship. I think it would be a serious mistake if the proposed legislation were even to pass the Senate by a narrow vote. Certainly it will pass, but I do not think it would encourage fairminded citizens, regardless of party, to undertake work in behalf of such important programs as the matter now pending before the Senate, if the programs are to be turned into partisan political footballs.

President Eisenhower tried to select people uniquely qualified to serve on the Commission, to approach the problems without regard to partisanship. President Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the four were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received \$2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at \$1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at \$2,100 a month and the others at \$1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their husbands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving \$487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately \$164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, \$205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive \$225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to \$164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving \$164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving \$487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is over staffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out

unnecessary spending and lop off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.

I am proud, as a supporter of the foreign policy of the administration, that we are pursuing a policy of isolation and insulation against Castro's Cuba. In

the end, despite what the new War Hawks, such as Mr. Nixon, have to say, I am certain that Castroism and Castro himself will be ousted entirely from the Western Hemisphere, due to the wise policy of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering my very able friend from Ohio, except to say that the hazards which confront this Nation are common to all the American people and that the incorrect decisions which are attributable to the man in the White House—any man in the White House—concern all of us. No one devoted more zeal or more courage to the cause of America and a just peace in the world than the gallant man from Gettysburg, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I remember that when Eisenhower finally decided to break off diplomatic relations with the infamous Castro regime this Chamber resounded with imprecations from some quarters against him for taking that step. I remember how proud I was when I stood on the floor to see the Democratic majority leader join the Republican minority leader in urging the Senate to approve legislation in the field of sugar and sugar quotas, by which that ugly Communist island would be prohibited from profiting from the sale of its sugar to this country. The Senate approved the Eisenhower bill only to see it die in the House. It is to the credit of the present Chief Executive of the United States, John F. Kennedy, that when he became President he asked Congress to enact the same kind of law recommended by a Republican administration and Congress did at long last do so.

Therefore, I simply say that in my opinion there is no need for anyone to defend the illustrious career in the White House of Dwight Eisenhower and of the Vice President at that time, Richard Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GALLANT NANCY BOYD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during its brief period of operation, the Peace Corps has won global admiration for the devotion, perseverance, willingness, and zeal of self-sacrificing men and women, of all ages and from every walk of life, who answered a unique call to service in the interest of democracy and of humanity.

The performance of the Corps indeed has demonstrated in remote corners of the earth the lofty ideals of America and the limitless sympathy which our Nation feels for those in less fortunate circumstances.

When they responded to the call, the Peace Corps volunteers signified a complete readiness to assume extraordinary responsibilities. They eagerly underwent rigorous training. They were content with unusually modest compensation. They were prepared to undergo physical hardship and to embark upon a mode of living far removed from the comfortable circumstances to which they were accustomed.

Now, in a tragic airplane accident in a foreign land, two members of the Peace Corps have given their lives. A resident of my State of California, Miss Nancy Boyd, of Martinez, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, was one. The other was Philip Water Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

Miss Boyd early joined this constructive program because she felt she could make a worthwhile contribution as a teacher, carrying the message of independence and self-determination and the dignity of man to younger generations who ultimately will be charged with keeping the flame of freedom glowing. In less than a year, as a member of the seventh contingent of volunteers sent to the Philippine Republic, this young woman, who received her training at San Jose State College in California, lay dead in the wreckage of a commercial airliner which crashed on Mindanao Island.

This patriotic young Californian, motivated by thoughts of the great opportunity offered in inculcating a love of liberty along with precious knowledge in children of another race and in a distant country, will be long remembered as a heroine of the cold war. I wish to pay tribute to her loyalty and her dedication to the cause for which she gave her life.

With these remarks, I wish to extend deepest sympathy to her parents and as evidence of the esteem and appreciation felt for her I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a message of sympathy from the President of the Philippine Republic, along with a letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, and a press release issued by that agency relating the tragic circumstances of her death.

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

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House:

We express the profound grief of entire Filipino nation at the death of two fine young persons, Nancy Boyd and Philip Maggard, of the Peace Corps, in airplane crash here. Their work in our country will long live in the hearts of our people. Kindly convey our sorrow to the American people.

President DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL.

— PEACE CORPS

Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As you know, Nancy Boyd had served with the Peace Corps since June 1962. She graduated in 1960 from Alhambra Union High School in Martinez, Calif., where she was a fine student and an active member of the student council. She worked two summers for the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill and had served as a practice elementary school-teacher in Martinez. Nancy was studying for a degree in history from the University of California in Santa Barbara when she joined the Peace Corps last summer.

From the time she arrived at San Jose State College to participate in the Peace Corps training program for the Philippines, Nancy impressed members of the Peace Corps staff, the San Jose faculty, and her fellow volunteers with her warmth, enthusiasm,

imagination, and her deep concern and interest in other people. She successfully completed the 8-week course in late August and left for the Philippines in September.

Nancy served as a teacher's aid in the small town of Mabini in Davao Province on the island of Mindanao. There, teaching science and English to elementary school children and deeply engaged in the work of the community, she won the hearts of all with whom she worked. One of 630 Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines, she was making a significant personal contribution to the development of the nation's educational system.

Returning to Mabini on March 3 from a Peace Corps training seminar in Zamboanga, the plane in which Nancy was flying crashed on a remote mountain in eastern Mindanao leaving no survivors.

Some time ago, describing her reasons for serving in the Peace Corps, Nancy wrote: "I think that understanding between peoples cannot help but lead to peace. * * * I believe that I could find much common ground with other peoples and that we are basically alike in many ways. Because of this belief in basic similarities I feel that by serving in the Peace Corps I could have a part in preserving the peace."

Nancy lived this part she described admirably. She was an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer. Her death represents not only a great personal loss to the Boyd family but a loss to our country as well.

If you can think of any way in which we can be of further assistance to Mr. and Mrs. Boyd, please do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

BILL MOYERS,
Acting Director.

PEACE CORPS PRESS RELEASE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Director of the Peace Corps, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and the superintendent of the schools in which they worked, paid tribute today to two Peace Corps volunteers who were killed Friday in the crash of a Philippine airliner on Mindanao Island.

The volunteers were Nancy Ann Boyd, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, of 805 Lafayette St., Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merida Maggard, of 207 S. Lobban Avenue, Buffalo, Wyo.

Both Miss Boyd and Mr. Maggard entered Peace Corps training in June 1962, as members of the seventh contingent of volunteers to be assigned to the Philippines.

After completing training at San Jose State College in California, they arrived in the Philippines in September and were assigned as elementary school teachers on the island of Mindanao.

Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, said: "I extend my deepest sympathies to the parents and friends of these fine young people. Nancy and Phil were both outstanding volunteers who were performing a valuable service to their country and to the Philippines."

The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, said the death of the volunteers "is a great and irreparable loss, not only to their parents, their country, and the Peace Corps, but also to the townspeople among whom they worked and to the people of the Philippines, for whom they dedicated their time, energy, and youthful ideals." He added: "Their loved ones should find consolation, indeed, inner satisfaction, in the fact that they have died in pursuit of the highest ideals of their country and the free world."

The volunteers were described as outstanding Americans who were doing highly commendable work by the superintendent of

schools of Davao Province, in which they worked. "They were very popular with our people," he said. "They will be missed greatly."

Funeral services for Miss Boyd will be held Saturday at 11 a.m. at the Connelly and Taylor funeral chapel, 1124 Ferry Street, Martinez, Calif. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Nancy Boyd Philippine Scholarship Fund, care of Mert Cerri, Bank of California, Martinez.

Miss Boyd graduated from Alhambra Union High School, where she was a member of the executive committee of the student council. She attended the University of California at Santa Barbara, majoring in history. She had worked during summers as a clerk-typist in the Contra Costa County school department and as an apprentice library assistant in the Contra Costa County library.

In her application for service as a Peace Corps volunteer, she noted that, as a history major, "I have a high interest in peoples of all countries, and wish to learn all I can about them." She added: "Also, I have a strong desire to do my part for my country."

Volunteer Maggard had planned on a career in the priesthood. An Episcopalian, he had been a member of the Acolyte Guild at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and vice president of the Canterbury Club at his church in Buffalo, St. Luke's. During one summer he had been church organist.

Of his plan to become a priest, he wrote on his application: "I have only 1 year of college left, and the idea of immediately entering seminary is rather frightening. For example, I would be ordained a clergyman at the age of 26 with practically no experience in the world itself. Since my ministry would be concerned with an attempt to help humanity, I feel that the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible."

He concluded: "And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I had left my area better than I had found it."

Besides the University of the South, he had attended the University of Wyoming at Laramie. During summers he had been employed as a State highway department crewman and as a printer's devil at the Buffalo Bulletin. He also had taught piano and organ to beginning students.

A CRITIQUE OF THE LAUSCHE TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] introduced an urban transit bill, S. 807.

Since a number of observations were made during the course of his introductory statement about the administration's urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 23 of my colleagues, I thought Senators might appreciate a few reflections on this important problem.

First, let me say how gratified I am to see this latest confirmation—notwithstanding the Senator's assertions to the contrary—that the problem of deterioration and decline of transit service in our cities and towns is truly a national crisis. How else can we explain the introduction of this extraordinary billion-dollar bill of direct and indirect Federal support to perhaps every single public or private transit company in the United States?

The bill speaks for itself as to the gravity and national scope of the transit crisis. It makes me wonder whether the

administration has not been entirely too modest and conservative in its approach to the problem.

Another important feature of the bill is its recognition of the fact that the severity of the problem is so great it requires what the Senator from Ohio described "at first blush would appear to be indirect Federal subsidies." And indeed the bill does provide subsidies, at first blush and at last blush.

But, Mr. President, while these are important concessions, coming from the leader of the opposition to effective Federal legislation in the field of urban transit, I must regretfully say that this is fundamentally bad proposed legislation, the justifications for which are filled with inconsistencies and contradictions.

I cannot help concluding that a vote for the bill will be a vote against helping our cities to alleviate the growing problem of traffic congestion and to provide genuinely improved public transportation service for the millions of bus, rail, and rapid transit riders of the country who want and need modern, dependable, and reasonably priced transit service.

I shall now discuss some of the contradictions that have been presented, and explain why the bill is so ill-conceived, unsound, and extreme.

I believe the analysis will demonstrate without doubt that the administration's proposed is infinitely more modest and sound.

I believe the analysis will also demonstrate that it is the bill of the Senator from Ohio, not the administration's bill, which runs the grave risk of wholesale intervention by the Federal Government into the rights and responsibilities of State and local governments and private enterprise—Federal intervention into everything from profits to working conditions in local transit systems.

THE CONTRADICTIONS

The Senator from Ohio charges that the administration's bill is a permanent subsidy program, whereas his does "not involve the Federal Government in a costly and permanent subsidy program."

The fact is, if Senators will take the trouble to examine both bills, that the exact reverse is true.

A subsidy is a form of Federal financial assistance given directly to a private enterprise. The administration's bill provides capital grants to public bodies for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The bill of the Senator from Ohio is a genuine subsidy through the granting of tax relief to potentially every private transit company in the country, regardless of need.

The administration's bill clearly terminates at the end of 3 years. The bill of the Senator from Ohio provides tax relief which, once granted, is permanent. It provides another form of Federal involvement which, once enacted, will last a minimum of 50 years.

The Senator from Ohio asserts as evidence that no national crisis exists—which his own bill belies—the claim that only the larger metropolitan areas, a few smaller ones, and organizations with

a vested interest have expressed support for the administration bill.

I suppose none of us is free from some kind of vested interest. But the fact is that the mayors of the Nation support the administration's proposed legislation, the county officials of the Nation support it, many Governors support it, many chambers of commerce support it, organized labor supports it, the rail and bus operators support it, the planners support it, the housing and redevelopment officials of the country support it, homebuilders support it, savings bankers support it.

The fact is that not only Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and a few other lesser sized communities have expressed support for the bill. Over the course of the last 3 years, Congress has heard as well from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Miss.; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala.; among others. In addition, since the enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the Agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

FLAWS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

What is proposed under title II of the Senator's bill, S. 807?

Briefly, the bill proposes that the Federal Treasury guarantee revenue bonds issued for the construction of wholly new rapid transit systems, or extensions thereto.

It is suggested that such guarantees would be available to either public or private transit agencies, but it is quite clear to anyone familiar with the subject that we are only talking about public agencies, for no private company is in a position to undertake such a large endeavor, and no city in its right mind would allow a private company, with the aid of the Federal Government, to walk in and on its own authority build a major new rapid transit system which would have profound effects on every aspect of that city's life.

This kind of transit operation has historically been a public responsibility, and actually it cannot be otherwise.

But the public transit authorities are public bodies, and, therefore, their bonds are tax free. What the bill provides, then, is a solid-gold windfall to private investors, who would enjoy not only tax-free interest on the bonds, but also no risk on their investment because of the Federal guarantee.

This proposal has several consequences, aside from providing such a luxurious windfall to the investors. For one thing, because it eliminates the element of risk, it eliminates the safeguards of prudence and careful scrutiny we normally expect from private investors when they are laying their money on the line.

But more serious is the fact that it opens up an entirely new type of investment opportunity—an investment involving no tax and no risk. Naturally, funds in the private money market will

be drawn to such an opportunity, and the consequence will be that the Treasury Department will have to pay higher interest rates on the bonds it is trying to issue, which are not tax exempt. Then, of course, this type of guarantee could be extended to any number of other worthy public endeavors, and Pandora's box would really be opened. Who would pay for this indirect subsidy? The taxpayer, of course, but he would never know how much he was paying because it would all be so indirect, unlike the administration proposal.

A second drawback lies in the fact that this type financial assistance puts maximum pressure on the farebox, which will have to bear the whole burden of the capital and operating costs of the transit system. This would require exceedingly high fares, which would have to be increased should the revenue be insufficient to pay off the principal and interest on the bonds. But this is an absolutely self-defeating effort, because the higher the fares, the fewer the riders. The whole point of mass transportation is to help to alleviate rush-hour traffic congestion by attracting as many riders as possible. This, above all, requires reasonably priced fares.

A third drawback involves a question of basic public policy. Under the bill, whether we are talking about public or private transit agencies, it would be entirely possible to have a major new rapid transit system imposed on a city without the responsible elected community officials or the people having a single word to say about it. Most transit authorities are independently managed by appointed officials, who I have no reason to doubt are perfectly capable, but who are, nonetheless, not directly responsible to the people of the community nor its elected officials. Under the administration bill, we can be sure that any new rapid transit system built in any city in the country will have the support of the people and their elected representatives, because they will be required to share a substantial part of the cost of the system with a cash contribution. This would not be the case under the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

THE DANGER OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Then we come to what is undoubtedly the most serious aspect of the guarantee approach—the cost and the likelihood of far greater Federal intervention in and control of the very things the sponsors of this bill presumably seek to avoid.

In essence, this proposal leaves the Federal Government holding the bag for the entire life of the transit agency's bond issue, probably 40 or 50 years.

Perhaps because the FHA guarantee program on home loans has been so successful over the years, we tend to think of Federal guarantees generally as relatively safe and inexpensive ways of getting something done which could not otherwise get done without the credit of the Federal Government backing it.

But I can assure Senators that the transit industry is not the housing industry, and we generalize at our own peril when we assume that the success

of guarantees in one field assures success in every other.

As a matter of fact, we need not look any further than the \$15 million federally guaranteed private loans on which the New Haven Railroad defaulted, requiring the Federal Government to pick up the tab.

Given the present trends of declining transit ridership and revenue, I think the Members of Congress would be well advised to think twice before committing the Federal Government to a permanent program of loan guarantees amounting to between \$750 million and \$1 billion in the transit field, depending on interest rates, should the program prove effective. It could be very expensive in the long run, by which time if there was widespread defaulting, there would be no alternative but for the Federal Government to bail the transit systems out.

This is not to say that the Federal Government should assume no risks in this field. I think the problem of traffic congestion demands that we must, but it should be with our eyes open.

Under the administration bill, the Federal Government must weigh the proposals submitted by the States or local governments, which will be demonstrating their confidence in the wisdom of the project through the willingness to assume at least one-third of the cost in cash. The Federal Government will make a grant on the basis of its best estimate of the likelihood that the project will be sound and successful, based on careful local planning—a provision lacking in the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

And then the Federal responsibility terminates.

If the project proves in later years not to be as successful as original estimates indicated, it will be the responsibility of the State or local government—not of the Federal Government.

In other words, we are not faced with a choice of an expensive way, through grants, as opposed to an inexpensive way, through guarantees, of accomplishing the same thing.

We are faced with assuming a known and limited Federal expenditure as opposed to an unknown long-term risk, which may or may not be more costly than the administration approach.

But in addition to assuming an unknown, long-term risk under the guarantee approach, we are also running a grave risk of large-scale Federal intervention in local transit affairs.

The reason is very simple. Since the Federal Government is holding the bag for the life of the bond issue, it cannot escape the responsibility of taking every possible step to insure that it does not end with a huge bill at the end of life of the bond issue.

Obviously, the amount that any local transit agency will have available to pay the principal and interest on the bond will be its net revenue—the amount left over after the operating expenses are subtracted.

But equally obviously, in order to insure that the net revenue will remain

sufficient over the life of the bond, the Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that fares are kept at necessary levels. The Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that unwarranted wage increases are not granted. The Federal Government will have to intervene continuously to make sure that managerial efficiency remains at a peak. It will have to intervene on questions of how much service is to be provided by the system to the community. It will have to intervene to make sure that the most economical maintenance procedures are followed and that equipment purchases are not excessively costly or unnecessary. Where private transit agencies are involved, it will have to intervene to make sure that profits are not excessive and that the executives are not getting paid too much for their service. And so on and on.

Is this the kind of situation that we want the Federal Government to get into? I do not think so. That is why the administration's proposal is so much more sound.

Not only does the Federal Government's financial responsibility terminate when a grant is made; its interest terminates, as well. Once the grant is made, all responsibility for the matters I have just mentioned remains where it belongs—at the local level.

I feel confident that the vast majority of the Members of Congress would prefer this much cleaner and more prudent approach.

USELESSNESS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

Finally, I come to the crowning irony of S. 807.

Not only does it suffer all the potential liabilities I have just discussed; it also suffers the fatal liability—and that is its almost complete uselessness.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in his introductory statement, stated that transit authority officials from Los Angeles testified last year that the bond guarantee financing approach would make it possible for them to build and pay for a transit system costing over \$600 million without a Federal loan or grant.

The Senator from Ohio concluded that—

It is only logical to believe, therefore, that if Los Angeles, the most auto-oriented city in the world, can support a complex system of the kind contemplated for that area out of the farebox, then cities having a less auto-oriented population should be able to support their own transit improvements.

However, I must point out several factors which render this conclusion wholly invalid.

In the first place, the officials testified only about the feasibility of constructing one segment of a much larger transit system through the bond guarantee. This was the so-called backbone route, a 22-mile rapid transit line running along the most heavily traveled and highly built-up corridor of the metropolitan area, the cost of which would have been \$288 million, not \$600 million.

The point is that this segment represented the cream of the crop, so to

speak, and these officials did not—and I am sure would not—testify that it would be possible to build any of the planned extensions out into the lower-density suburbs with bond guarantee financing. The revenues simply would not cover the capital costs of such extensions, guarantee or no guarantee.

But the most significant and overlooked fact is that the only reason why this project came within even close distance of being feasible with a bond guarantee is that the Los Angeles Transit Authority has jurisdiction of the surface bus system in Los Angeles, and the surplus revenues from the bus system, as well as the rapid transit system, would have been necessary to repay a substantial part of the principal and interest on the bond.

Thus without the revenues from the bus system, even this backbone project probably would not have been feasible. Also, quite obviously the same bus revenues would not be available to finance further extensions of the rapid transit system.

Then we must ask how many other cities have transit authorities which would have jurisdiction over both rapid transit and bus operations? And where this situation exists, how many of the bus systems enjoy sufficient revenue to help finance a rapid transit system, assuming that it were desirable to do so? Almost none.

The fact is that history and the experience of almost every other city fly in the face of the assumption that major capital improvements can be supported from the fare box, even with the help of a bond guarantee.

The European countries, with much more compact cities and far fewer cars per capita, have long since recognized the futility of relying exclusively on the fare box, and almost without exception they use public funds to cover the capital costs of their systems and fare box revenue to cover operating costs. I might add that New York City does exactly the same thing. It is, in fact, the only sensible solution.

THE TAX RELIEF PROPOSALS

As for the tax relief proposals, I have already pointed out that they are, of course, subsidies. From the standpoint of the general taxpayer, he still pays the bill, whether Federal expenditures are increased by x dollars or whether Federal revenues are decreased by x dollars, as would occur under my colleague's tax relief subsidies.

Again, however, it is interesting to note that under the administration bill the taxpayer knows exactly what he is paying. Under the other approach he does not, though I am informed that the tax relief measures might amount to somewhere between \$15 million and \$50 million a year.

Furthermore, not only does the taxpayer know what he is giving under the administration bill, he knows what he is getting. He is getting \$500 million worth of actual modernization and construction of mass transportation facilities and equipment. And this amount is, of

course, multiplied by the State and local contribution, as well as the private investment which the program would trigger.

But when the taxpayer pays for tax relief to purely private companies, how does he know what he is getting? Instead of improved transit service, he may be getting higher paid transit executives and richer stockholders.

I have long advocated that State and local governments give greater tax relief to faltering transit carriers. For reasons I shall not discuss here, I am quite confident that the administration's program will stimulate that effort.

But there is no doubt that a number of questions are involved in these tax proposals.

The foremost of them is, as I indicated, what assurance we will have that the tax relief will in fact result in better transit service?

In cities where there are a number of separate bus systems, or a mixture of transit systems, this financial assistance could possibly lead to greater confusion and lack of coordination of service, which is a problem that plagues many of our cities today, since the bill provides no planning requirements as the administration bill does.

On the value of the proposals to exempt transit carriers from Federal taxation to the extent they are granted tax concessions by State or local governments, I only question the belief of the Senator from Ohio that this would stimulate "considerably more action" on the part of the State and local governments.

Perhaps there is some reluctance to grant tax relief for fear full value may not be received by the private carriers because of the Federal tax laws, but I rather suspect that the reluctance is more basic than that—stemming from the fact that most of our State and local governments are themselves in very difficult financial straits, and simply cannot afford except under most compelling circumstances to give up any more tax revenue than they absolutely have to.

As for the proposal to establish tax-free reserve funds for new equipment, it is my impression that most State and local regulatory agencies already allow the establishment of such reserves. But more important is the fact that this proposal would be of benefit only to those transit companies which are making money and thus paying Federal taxes. It would be of no use to those who might need it most—the companies that are losing money.

AGENCY JURISDICTION OF TRANSIT PROGRAM

Finally, we come to the question of which agency shall have jurisdiction of whatever urban mass transit program is enacted.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that we dismiss the 2 years of experience the Housing Agency has acquired in administering this program, and that the President's considered judgment on the matter be overturned by transferring existing functions and any additional functions to a new Division of Urban Transportation to be located in the Commerce

Department's Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

I think it should be sufficient to ask, Who is better qualified to decide questions of executive branch organization than the President of the United States?

But let me make these additional observations.

First, as the Senator from Ohio himself acknowledged, we already have a variety of transportation activities which are not lodged in the Department of Commerce—from the ICC to the FAA. I would think that if we are to reorganize all the transportation activities of the Federal Government, it ought to be done in some comprehensive manner, rather than on this sort of piecemeal basis.

As for the suggestion that jurisdiction of the program was placed in the Housing Agency to avoid the "prohighway influence of the Bureau of Public Roads" let me say that the Senator from Ohio has never heard me make that statement. On the contrary, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing Agency have established an excellent working relationship with each other on their common concerns.

But, the basic point is that transit problems are fundamentally an urban problem, not a transportation problem. And this legislation has essentially nothing to do with interstate or intercity transportation, as for example between Boston and Washington.

This legislation is concerned with the movement of people within the urban area and you simply cannot deal with transit apart from the land uses of the urban area. The reason why many of our transit systems are having trouble today is that we have neglected the land-use aspect of the problem. The location and densities of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses are heavily involved in the determination of sound transit policies and in the administration of an effective transit program.

If this is, then, an urban problem, an inseparable facet of the shape and form of our cities, as I believe it is, then I think the logic of placing this program in the Housing Agency is inescapable.

And in fact, when the Housing Subcommittee was first considering this legislative area, back in 1961, we asked a wide array of witnesses about this relationship and the question of Agency jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this testimony be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that anyone who carefully considers this whole subject and the proposed legislation that is before Congress will agree that the administration's bill is sound, well conceived, modest, and better designed than any other to meet the urgent transit problems facing the country in a fashion that will strengthen and uphold the tra-

ditions and values that have made our Nation such a success.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY ON S. 345 ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RELATING MASS TRANSPORTATION TO OTHER HHFA PROGRAMS AFFECTING URBAN LAND USE

DR. WEAVER TESTIMONY

(House hearings, April 4)

Senator WILLIAMS. I don't want to prolong my part of this but I do want to deal with two other aspects of your statement, Dr. Weaver, which I certainly applaud you for. I think that the President in his objectives in terms of housing speaks of the necessity for the sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas and I was very interested in your statement on page 13 that increased emphasis would be given to the transportation and open space aspects of comprehensive urban planning. Now you are talking planning here in the 701 part of your legislation. I wonder can we conclude that there is also developing an attitude that following the planning and with the planning will go program? I take it that is true certainly in open space.

Dr. WEAVER. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And land reserves where the President spoke of the urgency and the need to get underway immediately.

Dr. WEAVER. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think that you would agree that the same program effort must come in transportation, which is so vital to land use and the proper, as the President says, sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.

Dr. WEAVER. I think there is no question that the administration is fully cognizant and very much concerned with the problem of mass transportation, realizing that it is a very, very vital part of the development of the communities and of the way in which housing and community development would mature as time goes on. I think also that there is complete agreement on the fact that we have to start and do more in the area of planning. There is also, I think, agreement that further action is required. There has not yet been any determination as to what that further action should be, but this is something which we are certainly cognizant of and certainly are trying to work out.

Senator SPARKMAN. While we are talking about community facilities, community development, etc., I would like to ask Mr. Slayton this question, and it bears directly upon this mass transportation program that Senator WILLIAMS asked a few questions about a few minutes ago. We did hold hearings in this subcommittee last year on this mass transportation problem that the big cities, primarily the big cities, have. But many people wonder why it was before the Housing Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, Mr. Slayton, or both of you, the community facilities and the urban renewal do; doesn't it tie right into your programs?

Mr. SLAYTON. Well, certainly it does, Senator. In the urban renewal program, transportation, mass transportation, becomes an extremely important part of your planning of the projects, and in the 701 planning assistance program this becomes an extremely important part. It ties into both very definitely.

Senator SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, isn't a great part of the problem that you usually find with the deteriorating central city area the mass transportation problem?

Mr. SLAYTON. It is indeed.

Senator SPARKMAN. Do you feel—and I believe Dr. Weaver has already indicated—that

if such legislation is passed you would be perfectly willing to take over the administration of it, and Dr. Weaver do you agree with what has been said as to its being inherently a part of our urban renewal and community development?

Dr. WEAVER. I think it is a very crucial part, Senator, and I think a very necessary part and one which, if we are going to do this job, we have to pay a lot of attention to it. Senator SPARKMAN. Yes.

Dr. WEAVER. Of course it would be no burden to take over the administration of it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not asking you to testify on it now, because we have had some hearings already in this subcommittee on the separate bill that Senator WILLIAMS introduced, but it is contemplated that if it is passed in anything like the form that Senator WILLIAMS has introduced it, that its administration will go to the HHFA, and I thought it well to put in the record some reason for that justification, and it is really a part of the program that we are carrying on.

MAYOR DILWORTH TESTIMONY

(Housing hearings, April 5)

Senator WILLIAMS. Just one more line of inquiry. Yesterday there was some discussion about mass transportation and its importance to the objectives of the various programs here, housing and urban renewal, community facilities and the college program. First, is it your feeling that improved and efficient mass transportation facilities are vital to the success of the objectives of the program here in the housing bill?

Mayor DILWORTH. Without immediate help—and I really mean immediate help—for mass transportation, and as I say, it is not just in the large cities, I think there is 400 cities, isn't there—

Mr. GUNTHER. Yes.

Mayor DILWORTH. Four hundred small cities, and by that I mean from 25,000 to 100,000 and 150,000, have lost all their mass transportation since World War II—have none, and it has hurt them terribly. In the larger cities I don't think—my own personal opinion would be that no plan for renewal of anything resembling the center city should be approved unless an area can come up with a decent mass transportation program because otherwise the renewal may prove valueless.

As you said, when we were testifying down here, we had a meeting at the request of the President, to spur up building, and a group of store owners came to us, builders of apartment houses, office buildings, theaters, and all of those things, and said to us that if they could be assured not only of continuity of the redevelopment program, and they were quite sure of that, but if they could be assured they were going to get some real help on mass transportation, they would be willing to pledge themselves to a total private expenditure in excess of a half billion dollars in the next 10 years in our center city. . . .

We can, with your bill, really solve our mass transportation problems, and again I think it is important to point out that the cities are doing their utmost. We are spending just on commutation alone now \$1,600,000 a year to get better commutation service. We are paying that direct to the railroads. We are going to spend this year and next year a total of \$14 million for capital improvements to commutation, for cars, improving the stations, parking and all of those things. But if we could get this additional Federal help we could really shoot ahead because in our own city one of the things that we have got to do is link together our two big commutation roads and make it a loop instead of two dead end operations. The result of that would be to save \$2 million in

operation, give us much more efficient service, permit interchange of cars using the same amount of car, also permit us to use subways, permit us to improve our whole big shopping area subway situation. The total cost would be \$40 million, the saving in excess of \$2 million. We can finance one-half of it but we cannot swing the other half. And if we could swing the whole deal we would immediately have a tremendous redevelopment and revival of our great heart of the city area.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mayor. Just one final question. I wonder if you would comment on the logic of the method of approach in dealing with mass transportation. Now the bulk of this housing legislation before us deals with the sound growth and development of metropolitan areas. The Housing and Home Finance Agency with old tools and with improved tools and some new tools is dealing with that problem. Transportation is vital to the success of it. Would you comment on the logic or the wisdom of giving mass transportation a place in this metropolitan program of Housing and Home Finance?

Mayor DILWORTH. I think, Senator—and this is as president of the United States Conference of Mayors and Vice President of the American Municipal Association—I think there is absolute unanimity on the part of the mayors, on the part of the staffs of both of our organizations—they both have excellent staffs—that there is only one logical place for the mass transportation program and that is in the Housing Administration. I don't think there is a dissent from any single mayor of a city of any size on that. The staffs of both groups are absolutely unanimous on it. It's just—well—it's just inconceivable to us that it could go any place else and be effective, and here it can be tremendously effective, because every renewal program, particularly for cities, ought to be studied in connection with the mass transportation program and the two ought to go hand in hand if they are to be effective.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mayor Dilworth.

HEARINGS ON S. 345 (MARCH 20-22)

William C. Wheaton, policy committee, National Housing Conference, and director, Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania:

"We support the provisions of the bill and stress these functions in the Housing and Home Finance Agency where they would be closely tied to the related programs of urban renewal and urban development. The Housing Agency now conducts a program of grants to the city and metropolitan planning which, in some cities like Philadelphia, have been of assistance in developing the kind of transportation plans to which Mr. Symes made reference.

"The bill contains incentives for the kind of metropolitan action which is certainly needed in the long run. The question in my mind is as to whether or not the bill might not also authorize interstate compacts in advance to solve transportation problems, but we believe that these functions can well be performed in the Housing Agency, which has experience with this kind of loan, fully repayable loan programs which has experience with grant programs; which has established ties with all the Government agencies and which is sympathetic to the objectives of providing transit service in connection with urban renewal programs for our central cities."

O. Roy Chalk, president, D.C. Transit:

"I would emphasize the very great need for the closest possible coordination between urban redevelopment on the one hand and mass transportation on the other hand.

"Urban redevelopment and mass transportation must and do go together hand in hand. Mobility of people and mobility of

goods are prerequisites for large metropolitan areas. Without mass transportation to move large numbers of people from place to place, there could be only villages. Without mass transportation, we could not have large industrial areas, extensive distribution centers, adequate housing facilities, recreational facilities, or any form of community life. * * *

"It is no exaggeration to say that most of the difficult problems facing our city and metropolitan area planners have their roots in the field of mass transportation. Transit is at the heart of such matters as population density, school locations, central city business stagnation, shopping center locations, airport locations, taxation policies, local governmental structures, and the like.

"Yet, billions of dollars are being and will be spent, publicly and privately, for massive suburbs and for urban redevelopment without taking into account the tens or hundreds of millions required for mass transportation needs.

"When properly tied in with investment for adequate mass transportation, our huge development and redevelopment expenditures more than justify their cost. In fact, the joint results are worth more than the separate outlays; it is an example of \$2 plus \$2 equaling \$6.

"As this subcommittee well knows, every house that is built requires a road, and every road requires a transit system to serve it directly or indirectly. Housing and transit are mutually interdependent. United and coordinated, both survive and flourish. Separated, neither can survive.

"The importance of mass transportation in urban redevelopment program is so great that the mass transportation plan for any given area should be made an integral part of the urban redevelopment program. Unless the mass transportation plan is integrated with the urban redevelopment plan, urban redevelopment programs will be obsolete before they are even instituted."

William B. Saunders, president, Transportation Research, and consultant for the Department of Commerce:

"My first reaction was a negative one last year when this came up, but I have really wrestled with that and I have concluded that certainly for the moment it makes more sense to give HHFA the basic responsibility for running this program. * * * I do have the feeling that as time goes on we will want to devise techniques for integrating the administration and the planning of our total transportation. This is going to have to be worked out slowly, both at the Federal Government level as I see it, and also at the local level. We are going to be creating new organizations as we go along in this field. * * * Yes, I think for the moment it ought to be given to HHFA to get the ball started rolling."

Edward J. Logue, development administrator, Boston:

"The Senate's passage of the predecessor to S. 345 last year was the first indication we had that the Federal Government took this problem as seriously as we in the major metropolitan areas knew it would become. We would also like to register ourselves in favor of the administration of this program by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and eventually by the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

"Any major, any urban mass transportation program in the older cities is closely linked with an urban renewal program and I may say that every single major older city has recognized need for a far greater, more comprehensive urban renewal program than they have undertaken today, but because of the metropolitan character and technical nature of the transportation problem it cannot be solved in a purely urban renewal context but it must be solved with the two of them together.

"This belongs, therefore, in the Housing Agency."

Anthony Celebrezze, mayor, Cleveland:

"Leave one end loose and you are going to get into difficulty, and if you leave mass transportation loose, you are going to be in real difficulty in the years ahead of us. * * *

"I firmly believe that this would be a proper function of the Department of Urban Affairs, if and when such a department is created. But I presume that if such a department is created, the HHFA would be part of it anyway, and the tying of the two under one administrative head would be essential. I think in the absence of such a department, because we have to work so closely with HHFA on urban renewal and on loans and so forth, this would be a proper department for it at this time."

Harold S. Wise, chairman, national legislative committee, American Institute of Planning:

"We support the program of planning that is incorporated in this bill. Then it recognizes the importance and key role of local planning of metropolitan and regional organization, and it recognizes also that there are other Federal agencies that are involved that are concerned with the development of the urban environment in our metropolitan areas, and seeks to achieve a coordination as between these agencies as transit is being planned. * * *

"We support the fact that you intend to place this agency within the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, because they are familiar, increasingly so, with the urban development problems in our metropolitan areas."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. 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.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE MALLORY CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday, the Washington Evening Star published an editorial in which it paid its disrespects to me because I believe in following the Constitution of the United States and upholding the great decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial criticism of me, which was published last Saturday, March 2, in the Washington Evening Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MALLORY CHAMPION

One might search far and wide without finding a pledge more superfluous than that given this week by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. The Senator told his colleagues that "I shall strenuously oppose any change whatsoever in the Mallory rule." This, in our judgment, is roughly comparable to a pledge from Horatius to the Romans that he would strenuously defend the bridge. After all—what else? If Horatius had fallen back, or if Senator MORSE should sheathe his pro-Mallory sword, who would be left to defend the people and slay the dragons?

The Mallory rule has its main impact and its principal adverse effect on law enforcement in the Nation's Capital. A test case on this question is shaping up in the Senator's home State of Oregon. But as of now the Oregon courts do not outlaw a voluntary confession merely because there has been a delay in arraigning the criminal. Yet the Oregon Senator will strenuously resist any change in the Federal rule which, merely because of delay in arraignment, has freed rapists and killers in the Nation's Capital.

In his remarks the other day, Senator Morse said he would not yield to pressure of a police department. Who has said that he should? He invoked the pre-Revolutionary specter of the British Crown, police-state methods, and the tyrannical fashion of the King's officers. Doubtless these are, or were, awesome instrumentalities. But what have they to do with the Mallory rule and 1963?

The proposed change in the Mallory rule would provide that a voluntary confession shall not be held inadmissible at a trial merely because of a reasonable delay in arraigning the person who made the confession. This is all that it would do. It would not revive the star chamber. It would not establish tyranny in this country. It would not license the King's agents to torture citizens and extort confessions from them. Everyone, or almost everyone, knows this to be so. The proposed change would simply establish in the city of Washington the same criminal law which prevails in the States. A confession which is voluntary could be used as evidence. A confession which is coerced or which, for some other reason, is involuntary, could not be used.

In 1958 a law to this effect passed the House and almost passed the Senate. It died on a point of order in the Senate at 4:10 a.m. on the closing Sunday morning of the session.

Senator Morse did not raise the point of order. He had, however, been active in organizing a small group of liberal Senators to talk the Mallory-change bill to death in that last night. In this connection, a friendly writer described Senator Morse as follows: "A fighting liberal of the last-ditch variety who is one of the Senates champion filibusterers."

This is puzzling. We had thought that the champion filibusterers came from the South and that they were illiberal, not liberal. But, on second thought, this characterization of Senator Morse may make as much sense as the ban in the Nation's Capital on voluntary confessions which would be admissible in the States, including the State of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pass along a bit of friendly advice to the Washington Evening Star: if it wishes to remove me from public life, a way to do it would be to publish a really favorable editorial about me. I might suffer a heart attack, and in that way it might be possible to get me out of the Senate.

I responded to the editorial by sending to the editors of the Star a letter which the Star got around to publishing today. I ask unanimous consent that my response to the Washington Evening Star be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DUE PROCESS OF LAW

The tongue-in-cheek tone of your March 2 editorial does not disguise the issue at stake in the current effort to overturn the Mallory rule and to perpetuate arrests for investigation, a practice the District of Columbia Commissioners admit is unconstitutional.

It is, of course, naive to expect the Star to be interested in the historic reasons why "due process of law" was required in Fed-

eral cases by the Constitution, or in the wisdom of our constitutional fathers in realizing that the techniques of a police state have timeless qualities, as have the essentials of personal liberty. To impress your editorial writer, I should have referred instead to the heavy reliance by Castro's secret police and the Soviet Committee for State Security upon the very same practice of detention of individuals at the pleasure of the police. Arrest for investigation is only our more polite name for it.

Let the Star and its readers be assured that there is great interest among citizens of Oregon in this general subject. In nearby Mountain Home, Idaho, a case involving a U.S. Air Force airman has brought many protests to my office. It concerns the detention of an Air Force enlisted man (white) in connection with the rape and murder of a Mountain Home housewife and the murder of her 2-year-old son. Airman Anderson was held and questioned off and on for 8 days by the Air Force. He, too, made a "voluntary" confession. He was then turned over to civil authorities and arraigned. Before his trial he repudiated his confession, and another man in civil custody on another charge confessed to the Mountain Home murders. Airman Anderson has been released and honorably discharged from the service.

However this case turns out, the Air Force has much to answer for; so does the Defense Department. The ambiguous conditions under which Anderson was held and the allegation by an Idaho judge that "gestapo" tactics of browbeating were used to obtain the confession, are under investigation by the FBI.

The question of what is "voluntary" is the entire issue in these cases. I am delighted that State practice in this area is to come under the scrutiny of the Federal courts, because the Constitution's 14th amendment requires the States, too, to follow due process of law. For the information of your editorial writer, it requires a test to be brought to the Federal courts by a complainant before a decision can be made by the Federal courts on the practice in Oregon or any other State on arrests and arraignment.

Your writer should also be informed that a U.S. Senator does not fix the laws and police procedures in his own State. His jurisdiction is limited to Federal laws. But I shall welcome the application of the same due process requirement to the States—including Oregon—as is required in Federal jurisdictions.

The Star is free to put the word "voluntary" in front of any kind of confession it wishes. For my part, I shall stand with the Federal courts in their determination of what can be presumed to be voluntary and what cannot. I continue to hope that someday the Star will join in encouraging respect for law and order in the District of Columbia by upholding the definition of law instead of flouting it.

As for the filibuster, I shall not embark on any defense of the Mallory rule through prolonged debate without first offering again my resolution to permit a simple majority of Senators to terminate debate. I always offer that proposal when I participate in prolonged debate. It would afford about 2 weeks for a minority to present its case before a vote is taken on the merits of the measure under consideration. Any time the Southern Senators beloved of the Star want to vote such a rule into effect, they will have my help.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star has complimented me by publishing another editorial attacking me. This editorial is

entitled "Our Verbose Correspondent." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUR VERBOSE CORRESPONDENT

Our chief regret in printing Senator WAYNE MORSE's letter is the amount of space consumed by his windy irrelevancies. His appraisal of the Star's position on the Mallory rule and arrests for investigation is unfortunate hyperbole—not because it is directed at the Star, but because it exemplifies a brand of political liberalism which handicaps valid law enforcement in the District of Columbia by obscuring the points at issue.

Instead of abdication of its legislative function to Federal judges of various persuasions in this jurisdiction, Congress should amend or clarify, as to its intent, rule 5(a) of Federal procedure. The broadening judicial interpretations of this rule and its basic principle since Mallory reflect more inventive genius than hitherto accepted precedent. Congress should also review and make more precise local statutes relating to police interrogation and detention in criminal investigation. The inadequacies in this field contribute to an uncertainty and confusion that discredit the police and make more difficult their prevention and solution of crime.

A determined search by Congress for appropriate and needed legislation would be of more benefit in dealing with a dangerous and disgraceful crime condition in Washington than any amount of pointless breast beating about due process under the Constitution by the verbose senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate this kind of political support, and I am accustomed to it. For years, the daily newspapers of my State which engage in the same kind of half-baked journalism in which the Washington Star engages have opposed me—except for a new newspaper in Portland called the Reporter, the Coos Bay World, and the Medford Mail-Tribune. I have also enjoyed the support of a highly select group of weeklies in Oregon, the Capital Journal in Salem, the Record-Courier in Baker, and one or two others. The opposition of so much of the Oregon press brings me thousands of votes, because the journalists of America do not fool the American people. The people of the country know that American journalism, by and large, has failed in its responsibilities under the first amendment to tell the truth. They also know that American journalism has—with some notable exceptions—succumbed to the powerful commercial interests which own the American press. So we find Pravda-like propaganda published in most American newspapers, such as the Washington Evening Star.

Let me say that I happen to be one politician who for 18 years in the Senate has not hesitated to "take on" the press, because I do not recognize the members of the press as particularly superior men. Their reading is generally limited to their own writings, and as a result we get from them such misrepresentations of fact and ad hominem arguments, which are so typical of the editorials of the Washington Evening Star.

This failure of the American press to tell the truth is becoming so widely accepted by the general public that the press is playing a smaller and smaller

role in American politics, especially in political campaigns. My difference with Mr. Nixon on the role of the press is simply that I think he was defeated in spite of the press, not because of it. Most of us are coming to welcome the opposition of the press because we have found so much distrust among voters of what they read in the papers.

The editorial which the Star has published today is particularly delightful; but after reading it and then reading my so-called "verbose" letter to the editors—to use the language used by the Star—one finds that at no point in the editorial do the editors of the Star join issue with me. They do not come to grips with the point I raised in support of the unanimous decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Of course in its editorial of last Saturday, the Star's editors talked about a voluntary confession; but they missed entirely the point of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mallory case. I say to the editors of the Star that their calling a confession a voluntary one does not make it voluntary. That is the very essence of the great constitutional issue which confronts Congress with respect to the Mallory case, for we find that when a person is arrested, and then is subjected to hours of "cross-examination" by a police department instead of being arraigned, presumptively he does not give a voluntary confession.

It was to protect that precious right of the American citizen against a situation which would permit of the third degree that the Supreme Court of the United States wrote its great historic decision involving the Mallory rule in regard to Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. President, we know what happens when mere men are given unchecked power, even though those mere men may be policemen, police chiefs, detectives, or police departments. For years I worked in the field of crime investigation. I know what the record throughout our history shows in relation to what flows from unchecked police departments across our country, and how sound the U.S. Supreme Court was in the famous Mallory decision.

If we are going to protect the liberties of the American people, we must see to it at all times that adequate checks are placed upon police departments so that they cannot exercise arbitrary power. Thus, the U.S. Supreme Court in unanimous decision has held that when an American citizen is arrested by a Federal officer—and I shall come to the State problem in a moment—that citizen shall be taken without delay to a committing magistrate to determine whether or not he shall be held or released. What is wrong with that?

As I said some years ago, if a U.S. Senator were willing to waive immunity so that he would be subject to arrest, and would walk out of the Senate Chamber some night and have a District policeman put his hand on his shoulder and notify him that he was under arrest, and then take him to a police station, those who are so anxious to change the

Mallory rule might for the first time appreciate the Mallory rule, for it is a rule that seeks to protect all, the innocent as well as the guilty.

Are we ready to waive another precious protection of free men—the presumption of innocence—and the requirement that the State and the Federal Government must establish guilt, or waive such rules as those that pertain to a requirement of immediate arraignment that protect the precious presumption of innocence?

I would not expect nonreading editors to familiarize themselves with constitutional history. If there ever was a collection of ignoramuses in regard to constitutional rights that surpassed the collection that comprises the editorial board of the Evening Star, I should like to see that collection of human beings, because in all the discussions of the Evening Star, in carrying on its propaganda drive to try to change this important U.S. Supreme Court decision, I have yet to read the first intelligent evidence that they are even aware of our constitutional history in the field of civil liberties and the protection of the guarantees, such as the guarantee of a presumption of innocence.

But I have come to expect such action from the Evening Star. Its editors amuse me, although I pity them for their ignorance. I am sad that a newspaper that ought to be a great defender of the precious right of freedom of the press would so abuse that right as to publish the kind of propaganda—Pravda-like in its nature—that it is publishing in respect to the Mallory case.

But in the editorial of last Saturday, the Evening Star irrelevantly commented on the law of Oregon. The editorial staff again showed their gross ignorance, for it is the law of Oregon that after one is arrested, he must be arraigned "without delay." They refer to a case that is shaping up in the State of Oregon which allegedly, according to the Washington Star, raises the principle of the Mallory case. They ought to read the case. It is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to determine whether or not a procedure that was followed in connection with the arrest of the person involved in the case in any way affected a confession that was elicited from the defendant.

Oregon statute 133.510 declares that after arrest upon warrant for felony:

If the crime charged in the warrant is a felony, the officer making the arrest shall take the defendant before the magistrate who issued the warrant or before some other magistrate as provided in ORDS 133.530.

The Oregon statute 133.550 states:

The defendant shall in all cases be taken before the magistrate without delay.

The Oregon case being brought to the U.S. Supreme Court involves a defendant held overnight before arraignment who claims that such delay was in violation of the statute.

Yet if Senators should read the editorial that appeared in last Saturday's edition of the Evening Star, they would be left with the impression that the police in Oregon can hold an ar-

rested person for whatever period of time the police desire to hold him. That does not happen to be the law of the State of Oregon.

But suffice for now, Mr. President. I do not expect that this is the last time that the editors of the Washington Evening Star and the senior Senator from Oregon will exchange their disrespects.

I only wish to point out that if Senators today read the editorial to which I have referred, and my letter to the editor published on the same page, it would become crystal clear that the editors could not meet me on the issues involved in the Mallory case. Therefore they resorted to their ad hominem arguments, for which I thank them, because if the time ever comes when I find the editors of the Evening Star writing anything favorable about the Senator from Oregon, I shall take a look at myself and see why I slipped so far. I am proud of the fact that I am not one of the favorites of the editors of the Washington Star.

As I say in my letter to the editors today to show how important the precious safeguard of the Mallory rule is, one only has to look to the Anderson case involving the Air Force in the State of Idaho, a case to the everlasting shame of the U.S. Air Force. In that case, Air Force officers held a man under examination for hours and wormed out of him a confession of double murder only sometime later to discover that he was not the guilty party. They found the guilty party, but he was not the one who had been subjected to the third-degree methods of the U.S. Air Force.

I am interested by the failure of the Star even to mention this case in its editorial of today.

The principle for which the senior Senator from Oregon is fighting goes back to the founding of this Republic, for it was one of the abuses of the star chamber proceedings of the British Crown, which led to the Revolution and brought this Republic into being.

It is so easy for us in these times to forget what was sacrificed to win these precious legal rights. I thank God that within a stone's throw of where I speak there is a great citadel of justice which can determine for the American people what is due process of law and can hand down great landmark decisions such as the Mallory case.

When there are such journalistic "peewees" as the editors of the Evening Star sniping at the heels of that great Court, they make themselves look truly ridiculous.

Mr. President, in a city with 54 percent of the population colored, with all the racial problems which are constantly arising, with unemployment at an exceedingly high rate and at an exceptionally high rate among the colored, we particularly need to be on guard to see that human rights under the law are protected for all, irrespective of the color of their skin.

In an executive session the other day I raised an alleged hypothetical case involving the handling of colored people in

the District of Columbia by the Washington, D.C., Police Department, and I asked the Chief of Police, if such a hypothetical were in fact a reality, whether or not he could justify it. He said that if those facts took place, it would be a mistake. Those facts did take place.

That case is not singular in the District of Columbia. Just as Mallory, a Negro, needed the protection of the principle of the Mallory case, which the U.S. Supreme Court gave him, let me say on the floor of the Senate today that the Washington Police Department must not be given unchecked power in the District of Columbia. It needs to be checked by the principles of the Mallory case, and needs to be constantly checked also by all the other precious safeguards of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in respect to criminal justice administration.

The senior Senator from Oregon is not going to be silenced, diverted, or intimidated by the ignoramuses who comprise the editorial board of the Washington Evening Star on any issue involving human rights in the District of Columbia or in the entire Nation.

I am well aware of the fact that there are forces in the District of Columbia not too happy about the fact that the senior Senator from Oregon uses his seniority rights to stay on the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. Because of my long years of service on the District of Columbia Committee, I know how important it is to have continuity of service on that District of Columbia Committee. I know how important it is to have serve on that committee one who is aware of the need for seeing to it that these precious safeguards protecting human rights and liberties in the District of Columbia have an ever-present guardian on the committee to maintain constant vigilance to see to it that wrongs are not committed.

It would be a great wrong, may I say, to change the Mallory rule in the District of Columbia and to give to the Washington, D.C., Police Department the unchecked power for abuse that would flow from the eradication or elimination of the Mallory rule.

There will be more later on this subject from the senior Senator from Oregon not only in future replies to the Evening Star but also in future replies to others who for some reason think that a police department cannot enforce the law unless it is given unchecked power.

I take pride in the fact that I have always supported the strengthening of the Washington, D.C., Police Department in terms of its funds, as to enlarging its staff, and as to giving it the assistance for which it asks within the framework of constitutional guarantees. But let me make clear to the chief of the Washington Police Force today that I do not intend to go along with the drive which he is heading, with the assistance of the editorial board of the Evening Star, seeking to give to his Police Department the unchecked power for the abuses that I am sure would result therefrom by the elimination of the rule in the Mallory case.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

COMMENDATION OF HOWARD MORGAN—RESOLUTION OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREG., DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication I have received from Mr. Frank L. Roberts, chairman of the Multnomah County, Oreg., Democratic Central Committee, Portland, Oreg., setting forth certain resolutions which were passed at the last meeting of the committee.

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

MULTNOMAH COUNTY DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear SENATOR MORSE: I have been asked to inform you of the following resolution which was adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County at its regular monthly meeting on February 28, 1963:

"Whereas the Democratic Party traditionally has fostered the conservation and development of the Nation's resources for the benefit of all the people, and thereby has greatly advanced the well-being of the Pacific Northwest in particular; and

"Whereas President Kennedy's administration has marked a return to the best traditions of the Democratic Party in subordinating special privilege to the general public interest; and

"Whereas Howard Morgan has demonstrated, in national and State office, and in public and party office, those qualities of integrity, vigor, fearlessness, and intellectual capacity which are especially important in the protection of the public interest in the Nation's resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee commends Howard Morgan for his outstanding service as Federal Power Commissioner in the promotion of sound public power policies, expresses its regret that he has decided to remove himself from this position of great public trust, and voices its hope that this action represents but a temporary retirement from public life; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body urges the President of the United States, in his search for a successor to Howard Morgan, to seek out and to appoint a man who has demonstrated in practical application the same qualities of character in the discharge of public trust; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to Commissioner Morgan, to the U.S. Senators from Oregon and to the Congresswoman from Multnomah County."

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. ROBERTS,
Chairman.

DEATH OF DR. JUAN MARIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Richard Butrick, a retired Foreign Service officer residing in the District of Columbia, has informed me of the death in Chile of Dr. Juan Marin.

Dr. Marin's passing is a genuine loss to the United States. On December 8, 1941, while serving as Chilean Chargé d'Affaires in China, he immediately offered his services in representation of the several hundred Americans, both offi-

cial and private, and their interests in Shanghai, and carried on in that capacity, at considerable personal danger from inflamed Japanese, until the U.S. Government several weeks later appointed the Swiss Government as its official representative.

Dr. Marin, whose broad-faceted career included service as a doctor, naval officer, diplomat representing Chile in China, India, Egypt, and San Salvador, and distinguished contemporary writer, at the time of his death was on leave from his position as Director of Cultural Affairs of the Organization of American States and serving as director of the summer school of the University of Chile, which was dedicating this session to a study of inter-American relations and the operation of the Alliance for Progress.

In his many posts abroad and in Washington since 1956, Dr. Marin and his wife, Milena, established a wide circle of devoted American friends who will greatly miss him and whose sorrow at his passing merges with that of his widow.

THE LUMBER SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently a number of bills were introduced designed by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association to assist in dealing with the subject of lumber imports.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the following items: A letter of February 25 from Mr. Mortimer Doyle, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association; my letters of January 7 and March 1 to Mr. Doyle; a letter to the editor of the Oregonian by a lumberman who is a member of the Oregon State Legislature, Mr. Sidney Leiken; an Oregonian article of February 22 on the timber capital gains tax; a memorandum by the Western Forest Industries Association on the lumber standards issue; an Oregonian story on ICC action to reduce the transcontinental rail rates on lumber; and five news stories and editorials regarding the efforts by western lumber marketers to secure what they believe to be equitable treatment in the shipment of lumber by rail through return of the freehold privilege.

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

(See exhibits 1 through 12.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the ICC action on rail rates, I note that southern lumber producers objected to this action, which would benefit western lumber shippers and consumers nationally to the extent of \$20 million annually.

It is interesting to note that the large lumber operators oppose the efforts of the smaller operators in the Northwest to secure a railroad freehold opportunity while the large operators appear to have certain advantages of their own.

One Oregon lumber producer told me, and I quote him:

The dual nature of these large industry giants has reached proportions where the

smaller operators and wholesalers are being quietly clubbed to death under the noisy banner of concern over our poor, beleaguered Northwest lumber industry.

At the identical time that these large lumber giants who support and dominate the major industry trade associations were petitioning the Congress and Maritime Commission for Jones Act relief, they were fighting our widely supported rail petition which would grant relief to hundreds of smaller rail mills from pressures created by decisions of the past 2 years which have restricted the marketing freedom by rail of these smaller mills. As the Tariff Commission has denied the recent application for restriction of Canadian imports, these smaller mills need every bit of internal domestic assistance possible to stay alive in this age of consolidations, mergers, and bigger business. We, as an association, as lumber businessmen, and as private citizens are more greatly disturbed than ever at the ability of these giants to stifle a service which would have been of continued assistance to the entire lumber industry; whereas, the denial of this service could only serve to the advantage of those who are blessed with the resources and vast sales apparatus to be able to avoid in-transit sales.

At the San Francisco public hearings on this tariff, 11 mills appeared in opposition to this proposal and they included such giants as Weyerhaeuser, Georgia-Pacific, Simpson Timber, International Paper, etc. What was significant to me was that their opposition to this proposal was not based on any grounds that it might be harmful to the Northwest lumber industry, but rather their opposition concerned itself with the railroads profit plight, boxcar shortages, and other objections one step removed from the problems of the Northwest lumber manufacturers.

The letter from Mr. Sidney Leiken, included as one of my exhibits, points out his causes of concern, and he is especially disturbed over the position taken by some in the industry regarding the Federal Wage and Hour Act.

In addition, the Western Forest Industries Association expresses strong concern over efforts to change lumber standards. The association contends, for example, that one facet of the proposal being advanced by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, if adopted, would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra thickness of lumber. He would be required to pay additional freight as compared to the dry lumber producer, and the impact upon the green lumber producer would be close to \$10 million in additional freight rates. It is the position of this organization that the present data on lumber shrinkage and strength is inadequate, and they urge that there be a thorough and careful review so that the overall result would be beneficial to the entire lumber industry and to the users of wood.

On the tax front, the administration has proposed a substantial revision of the present capital gains afforded timber. The Treasury Department data indicates that a possible two-thirds or even more of the benefits of this provision of law is enjoyed by 25 out of 7,500 corporations. I have not yet reached a conclusion on the extent to which the Treasury tax proposal will affect the overall lumber situation, but I would hope that what can be achieved will be

an equitable spread of the taxload and the elimination of favoritism to a select few in the tax laws.

There is one final item on which I would like to comment briefly, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement on national forest timber sale activities for calendar year 1962 be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 13.)

Mr. MORSE. Last June 12 the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on behalf of all the northwest Senators, asked that the Forest Service provide a better reporting on its activities. This has been done and I call to the attention of those in the forest products' industry both the overall picture and, for the benefit of those in particular areas, the situation where they operate.

In my judgment, this report is extremely encouraging, while, at the same time, providing the basis for improvement. The timber harvest during 1962 was the highest ever on the national forests, exceeding the 1959 record by 300 million board feet. The record shows a continued strong interest in the purchase of national forest timber and a continuation of bidding by the industry, often in amounts substantially in excess of Forest Service appraised rates.

I take particular note of the candid manner in which the report presents data and the statement that "improvement is needed in a few localized situations." On certain national forests in Oregon, there is evidence that sale of timber can be improved, and I trust that rapid action will be taken in those locations to do this to the full extent that there is a market for the timber.

These exhibits form an interesting panorama for they give some insight into the diverse points of view in the highly competitive lumber industry. Even more, they indicate, as I did in my letter to Mr. Doyle on March 1, the difficulty of getting a definition of the true situation, the causes, and the best solutions to existing problems.

It is my intention to do all I can to help our domestic lumber industry, for I am convinced it does have problems. It would be a disservice for me to do less than show that the course to be taken is not easily chosen.

I welcome the introduction of the several bills to deal with lumber matters and hope that as we proceed with the legislative process we can identify the real problems and select reasonable solutions.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 7, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Many thanks for your good letter of November 26. I have been giving a great deal of thought to the facts contained in that letter and the overall aspects of the problems facing our domestic lumber industry.

I believe it would be most useful to have prepared an analysis of the various steps which might be considered. Such an analysis should include those things which can be done by the industry itself, those things

which might be done by local and State governments and those things which might be done in cooperation with private organizations and groups and those steps which might be undertaken by the Federal Government.

In the field where the Federal Government would be involved, it would be useful to include discussions of the steps which would be taken administratively and those which would require legislation. Such an analysis should be set forth in as succinct a form as possible with appropriate references to the laws applicable and the exact changes in legislation which might be considered. This would form an extremely useful basis for future definitive consideration.

In my talks with numerous people during the fall, I have become convinced that the best possible course to take is the one which produces long-range solutions, but at the same time there must be very careful selection of the steps which can be taken immediately so that long-range solutions will have the opportunity to be fully effective.

Inasmuch as the Tariff Commission has not yet made the recommendation, there is no way to ascertain the conclusion it may reach, and thus it would be useful to chart a course based on steps which would be desirable in the event of an affirmative finding by the Tariff Commission and the steps that would be desirable if their finding is negative.

It seems to me that the association and my colleagues in the Senate and House should continue to stress the importance of industry divided solutions which involve the minimum intervention on the part of the Government.

I say this because while I have no personal objection to the Government participating in those facets of economic and social affairs where this participation is indicated, I firmly believe that the best effort occurs when the individuals concerned make a maximum contribution to their own welfare.

I would be pleased to discuss further steps with you when you have had a chance to prepare the material suggested. I recognize that this is a substantial request to make, but I do not think it more than you would want to do yourself in the light of the situation confronting the industry.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LUMBER
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your kind letter of January 7 requesting information on the lumber industry's major problems, and the programs which it has recommended and is pursuing in an effort to effectively resolve these problems.

Some of these matters are, of course, more urgent than others, and, of course, it would be impossible in a letter to evaluate thoroughly all aspects of our industry's numerous and complex problems. However, I sincerely hope that the material set forth in the following paragraphs of this letter will be of some assistance to you.

In analyzing our problems, I cannot avoid feeling—particularly in the light of our existing economic problems—that unless something is done to bring about immediate action to resolve these problems we will suffer an economic decline during the next few years far worse than the rate which we have experienced in the recent past.

It is axiomatic that an industry to be prosperous must enjoy continuing and sustainable growth attended by an ever-rising level of overall demand for its products. Only under such circumstances will it be

able to supply job opportunities for a steadily growing population and make the reasonable profits necessary to encourage adequate investment. Our industry has urged and will strongly support an economic program that (1) leads to expanding employment; (2) encourages private investment; (3) creates rising productive efficiency and lower costs; (4) provides better prices and greater buying demand; and (5) increases production and is a source of reasonable profits.

As you point out in your letter, an essential quality of self-government is that the private individual is permitted to have the largest practicable degree of decision making and, in accordance with this principle, that government is best which interferes least, so long, however, as such individual's actions are consistent with those national purposes which are considered central to the welfare of our society.

On the other hand, we must recognize that government is an agency of the people and must be utilized to serve those purposes and do those things which individuals cannot and should not do. The international ramifications concerned with our import problem, for example, preclude individuals from taking any direct action to resolve this problem. The government must do this.

Some of our problems admittedly are very difficult, but their difficulty does not mean that they can be ignored. President Kennedy has said that "this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems." We firmly believe that the administration is aware of our industry's dilemma, and that it is sympathetic. Indication of this may be found in a statement on the lumber problem prepared by the Forest Products Division of the Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, copy of which is enclosed. Although we would not agree with it in its entirety, it is, overall, a good report.

To date, however, our Government has prescribed hardly any medicine for our malady except exhortation. We strongly urge that our Government now examine its own responsibility to the American lumber industry and its employees, and following this with the affirmative action that is needed to improve the economic position of our industry, and those communities and their citizens which are dependent upon a prosperous forest products industry for their continued existence.

Briefly outlined, the major problems of our industry, and our recommendations for their equitable solution, include the following:

TAXATION

The primary issue with respect to taxation, insofar as the timber industry is concerned, relates to the application of capital gain treatment to timber proceeds. To assure the equitable tax treatment of forestry and timber operations the industry supports the programs conceived and advanced by the forest industries committee on timber valuation and taxation. This committee vigorously opposes any proposals which endanger the equitable tax treatment of timber income.

We were quite shocked to learn that among the administration's tax revisions proposed to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 6 by Secretary Dillon was a repeal of the capital gains treatment of income from timber.

Under the changes proposed by Secretary Dillon, net proceeds from timber sales exceeding \$5,000 (regardless of the kind of transaction involved) would be treated as ordinary income and taxed accordingly. Some industry spokesmen assert that repeal of the capital gains treatment would place the lumber industry in a worse position than

prior to 1944 when the law was enacted. Even then, they say outright sale of timber was afforded the capital gains treatment. The new proposals would have no such provision.

Enactment of this proposal, coupled with the problem of constantly mounting imports, could easily result in the destruction of our industry as a major element of the American economy, and the primary source of industrial employment in thousands of American communities.

Other tax problems also exist. The lumber industry believes it is inequitable for its trucks, using private roads, or roads privately constructed and maintained, to be required to pay the taxes used to construct and maintain the Interstate Highway System. So far, our efforts to get Congress to enact legislation to eliminate this tax have been unsuccessful. We intend, however, to continue to press for equity in this area.

LUMBER IMPORTS

Our country imported approximately 4.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber from Canada last year or approximately 17 percent of U.S. softwood lumber markets as of the close of the year. This percentage is expected to rise substantially in 1963 unless counteraction is taken.

In an effort to reasonably resolve the unemployment and operation problems imposed upon the American lumber industry by an unchecked flood of imported Canadian softwood lumber, the industry constantly seeks the assistance of Congress and other responsible public officials. It has held a number of informal congressional conferences. It has pursued congressional and administrative hearings. It instituted an unsuccessful escape clause appeal before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Among the possible solutions to its import problem, the industry has consistently recommended: (1) Establishment of an import quota on softwood lumber by direct legislative action; (2) that measures be taken to require that all imported lumber be marked to show country of origin (Canadian lumber has been specifically exempted from this requirement); (3) that lumber be made eligible under the quota provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act so that quantitative limitations could be placed on the importation of forest products into the United States; (4) implementation and extension of the buy-American principle as may be necessary to assure that all lumber and wood products used in construction federally financed or federally insured (as in FHA-insured housing) is of domestic manufacture; and (5) that a thorough market study in foreign countries should be made in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, with the specific objective of expanding the export of American forest products.

RIGHT-OF-WAY (NATIONAL FOREST INGRESS AND EGRESS)

I have written you separately, February 21, on the matter of rights-of-way across national forest land to permit access to private land. Clearly, the Government should agree not to demand a reciprocal right-of-way of greater value than the value of the right-of-way across Federal land a private owner requests. Also, provision for immediate access to inholdings, where needed, must be included in recommended legislation and the determination of values of rights-of-way must be placed in impartial hands.

APPEALS PROCEDURES

The Forest Service in its management of the national forests is not subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision in any dispute over timber sales matters remains with the seller—the Forest Service.

On February 21, 1962, the lumber industry presented the Secretary of Agriculture

with a program to help improve the timber management and sales practices of the U.S. Forest Service. One of these points was a request for a more equitable method to appeal administrative decisions of the Forest Service.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture has ample authority to establish a new appeals procedure, enactment of special legislation may be necessary to insure that corrective action is taken. Such a law would assure a timber operator an appeal to a level higher than the one with which he is dealing on his contract, and additionally, there should be a further appeals board established within the Department of Agriculture.

WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

The lumber industry, generally, is not convinced that general wilderness legislation is necessary. During the last Congress a bill to set aside up to 15 million acres (there would be an additional 45 million acres of land that could be affected and eventually might become wilderness lands) of wilderness, wild canoe, and primitive lands for the national wilderness preservation system was the subject of much action, and, in fact, it passed the Senate.

However, while not advocating legislative action, lumbermen will generally support wilderness legislation which includes a requirement for (1) a review of primitive lands before they are recommended for inclusion in a wilderness system; and (2) positive congressional approval of any wilderness additions.

FEDERAL TIMBER SALES PROCEDURES

At present, the Forest Service manages timber under the basic law of 1897 which requires only that timber be "designated and appraised" and advertised and sold. Under this authority Secretaries of Agriculture have so far written 29 regulations, some of which have been withdrawn or superseded over the years. The Forest Service timber management program is governed by these regulations.

The first proposal in this area which the industry endorses has to do with management of national forest timber and would establish standards of performance for national forest management. It would require an annual report in the nature of an accounting which could be used to appraise the productivity of the national forests.

The second has to do with timber appraisal practices and is intended to allow the Forest Service to sell Government timber without taking advantage of its monopoly position where there are no alternative sources of timber supply.

The third proposal is a request for a new appeals procedure. It proposes a prompt and impartial procedure for resolving contract and contract administration and performance differences. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision remains with the seller, the Federal agency.

The fourth proposal is a request for a complete revision of the timber sales contract form in order to establish a normal buyer-and-seller relationship between the Forest Service and the industry. At the present time, the contract form permits a one-sided relationship of the seller, permitting arbitrary, unilateral seller domination of the buyer-and-seller relationship. With the exception on the appeals procedure matter, no new legislation is recommended at the present time.

WOOD PROMOTION

The erosion of the domestic lumber market in the mid-1950's had a different and alarming ring than previous short-lived fluctuations and resulted in the first move toward the formation of a national wood promotion program, and the beginning of

efforts to analyze the industry's current and prospective merchandising, research, and promotion program at all levels.

It was determined during this period that a positive stepped-up sales promotion, plus a comprehensive product development and marketing program, was needed to halt lumber's loss of volume. A vital action program involving at the present time expenditures amounting to an estimated \$10 million or more annually, and financed through national, regional, and company sources, is being carried forward actively. While the industry has been heartened by the results of this overall effort, there is much work to be accomplished before its success can be measured. Currently, the NWPP is devoting its efforts to gaining the cooperation and support of all groups interested in increasing the demand for lumber and wood products.

LUMBER GRADES AND STANDARDS

The industry's recommendations for resolving problems concerned with lumber grade simplification and standardization call for (a) standardization of industry grade names for all species of softwood lumber used in residential construction to facilitate ease of specification by the home building industry; (b) grade descriptions to supply comparable quality based upon end-use requirements to make lumber more economical and less confusing to use; (c) standardized sizes for seasoned and unseasoned lumber which will place lumber standards on a sound technical and more meaningful basis; (d) a new size of boards (five-eighths inch thick) for sheathing and subflooring to make lumber more competitive with other materials which are only one-half inch or less in thickness and which are presently making strong inroads into lumber housing markets; and (e) a simplified method of presenting span tables for joists and rafters. We are actively working toward these goals.

Quite frankly, Senator, we could go on ad infinitum with a monolog of the problems of our industry and their recommended solutions. We are, however, aware that your keen interest and concern has made you quite knowledgeable about our industry and its problems. Because of this, I have attempted only to highlight in writing those areas which at the moment are of the most serious concern to lumbermen throughout the Nation and our proposals for equitably and immediately resolving them.

Admittedly, our industry is faced with some problems created by the thrust of new technology and automation. These obstacles are minor, however, for our economic difficulties have not been due primarily to the lack of a skilled labor force or to a lack of managerial skills or inventiveness. The greatest deterrent to the growth of a strong domestic lumber industry lies in the threat of inequitable tax treatment by our Government, and in a flood of foreign lumber, particularly at a time when it is not needed. The problems of our industry are economic problems and not technological problems.

Unless a reasonable limitation on lumber imports is immediately effected, we firmly believe that (a) lumber imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply; (b) there will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production, and (c) this Nation may, perhaps, someday regret to find itself without a domestic lumber industry able to meet its lumber and wood products needs.

Jobs and job opportunities are declining in our industry. Our profit rate is also declining. The demand for U.S.-produced lumber is insufficient to meet existing productive capacity. We cannot hope to grow in technology without a higher rate of investment, and entrepreneurs simply will not invest in an industry unless they see growing markets for its products.

Any member of our NLMA staff will be glad to discuss further with you, or any member of your staff, the chronic rise in idle manpower and plant capacity in our industry, and our recommendations for coping with the serious economic slack which has gripped our industry during the past few years. I am enclosing a copy of the several proposed laws that we believe will be of help to do that which you have said is so important, "to keep the cash registers ringing on Main Street" in our lumber-dependent communities.

Your interest and concern in the American lumber industry and its employees is, of course, greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER B. DOYLE.

PROPOSED REFUND OF HIGHWAY USE TAXES IN THE CASE OF OFF-HIGHWAY USE OF VEHICLES

The attached proposed bill is based on the premise that highway users should pay for the expanded highway construction program; and the converse of this, that non-highway users should not pay for the expanded highway construction program.

"It is no more proper that those who do not ride the facility be charged for a ticket on it than for everybody to be forced by law to buy a season round-trip ticket every year on the B. & O. Railroad whether they ever ride that or any other train." (C. D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, before the House Ways and Means Committee, March 14, 1961.)

The forest products industries own and operate thousands of trucks for logging purposes that move largely on privately owned or privately maintained road systems in the forested regions of the United States. It is unfair for these trucks to support an interstate highway system which they will never utilize when at the same time the owners of these vehicles are expending large sums of money to build and maintain their own road systems.

The proposed amendment is not an exemption from the highway-user taxes. It does,

however, provide a refund of such taxes based upon the extent to which vehicles operate over privately owned or otherwise privately maintained roads.

As in other tax refund circumstances, the burden is upon the taxpayer to maintain the necessary records to prove his entitlement to the refunds. Experience under comparable State tax refund statutes demonstrate the administrative feasibility of such a refund system.

The proposed amendment is in complete accordance with the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program and actually implements the user-tax principle of the highway trust fund.

PROPOSED BILL, 88th CONGRESS, 1st SESSION

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refund of the highway use tax in the case of trucks and other vehicles which do not operate on the Interstate Highway System, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special cases in which tax payments are considered as overpayments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(R) If a highway motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon a public highway or not, operates over (1) any road, thoroughfare or property in private ownership, or (2) any public road or thoroughfare constructed by, or maintained by, the owner of such motor vehicle who is not otherwise reimbursed for such construction or maintenance, or (3) any road or thoroughfare pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or of any State or with a licensee of any such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct such road at his own expense, to maintain the same at his own expense, or to pay any such agency or its licensee a reasonable consideration for the use of such road or thoroughfare, and such highway motor vehicle uses or consumes articles in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4041, subsection (a) (1), (3) or (4) of section 4071, or section 4081, or such highway motor vehicle is one in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4481, the Secretary or his delegate shall refund (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such article or to the person in respect of whom tax has been imposed under section 4481, a proportionate part of such tax based upon the number of miles traveled by such highway motor vehicle over such road, thoroughfare or property as compared to the total number of miles traveled by such vehicle. The Secretary or his delegate shall have authority to prescribe regulations and record-keeping requirements in respect of such refund."

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO

OREGON

Tax imposed

A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories "for use of the highways," the tax to be used for public highway construction. (O.R.C. 767.325.)

Refunds or credits

Excludes application of tax to persons or motor vehicles "when operating over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership" or "when using any road or thoroughfare, other than a State highway or county road, pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or with a licensee of such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct or maintain it at his own expense, or to pay such agency or licensee of such agency a reasonable consideration for the use * * * of such road. * * *". (O.R.C. 767.035.)

Recordkeeping

Requires daily mileage record on all vehicles and monthly report thereon; gives commissioner other broad supervisory powers—"Regulatory and Enforcement Provisions." (O.R.C. 767.405-767.990.)

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO—Continued

TAX IMPOSED

A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories of commercial vehicles based on mileage operated over State highways. (I.C. 49-127.)

Six-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels usable as fuel for operation of motor vehicles. (O.R.C. 319.000.)

Six cents a gallon on special fuel used in "any motor vehicle while operated upon the highway" (tax is collected at time of sale by the seller from the user). (I.C. 49-731, 730.)

Six-cent-a-gallon use fuel tax imposed on motor vehicle fuels (diesel, etc.). (O.R.S. 319, 520, 530.)

IDAHO

Refunds or credits

Allow deduction at time of payment for "miles traveled on roadways maintained with private funds by agreement with the public agency or agencies having jurisdiction over the same." (I.C. 49-127.)

OREGON

Provides refund to person using fuel for operating a motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon the public highway or not, if used over privately owned, or privately built or maintained roads, such refunds being based upon a proportionate part—"The proportionate part shall be based upon the number of miles traveled over such roads" as compared to the total vehicle mileage. (O.R.C. 319.320.)

IDAHO

Allows refund to person who has paid fuel tax, either directly or indirectly, where fuel has been "used for purposes other than for the propulsion of motor vehicles upon the public highways. * * *" (I.C. 49-736, 737.)

OREGON

Provides exemption for fuel used in propelling vehicle "over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership," or over any road built or maintained by the user at his own expense under agreement with any agency. (O.R.S. 319.540.)

Recordkeeping

Quarterly report required on mileage operated over State roads; vehicle owner required to maintain records and to purchase documents to justify use of rate schedules in code; penalties provided. (I.C. 49-127a.)

Authorizes secretary of state to impose recordkeeping and refund requirements. (O.R.C. 319.320.)

Licenses required of special fuel dealers; records and monthly reports required of both dealer and user; penalties provided for failure to keep records. (49 I.C. 733, 734, 735, 746.)

Use-fuel tax license required of user; faithful performance bond required; emblem required to be displayed upon vehicle; monthly reports required. (O.R.S. 319, 550, 570, 600, 690.)

EXHIBIT 3

MARCH 1, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
Executive Vice President, National Lumber
Manufacturers Association, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your good letter of February 25, responding to the suggestion in my January 7 letter to you regarding lumber industry problems, was very much appreciated. As I have told you in the past, I think that we can work together on those points upon which we are in agreement, and we need not be disturbed should we not be in full agreement on every issue.

On the matter of taxation, as it relates to both capital gains and road use, I have not reached a final decision. Should there be information and material which the forest industrial committee on timber evaluation and taxation feels would be useful to me, I would be very pleased to have it. I am taking the liberty of transmitting the material on the road-use tax to the Secretary of the Treasury for analysis.

On the matter of lumber imports, it is my view that action should be taken which will protect our domestic lumber industry against unfair competition from outside. Already the administration has done a number of things which I believe have proven useful. These include the \$25 million change in depreciation allowance schedules and the recent decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission on lumber freight rates from the Pacific Northwest, estimated by the ICC to have an effect of \$10 million annually. The Federal agencies have been proceeding vigorously with a domestic lumber procurement program; the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have not only increased allowable cuts from the public forest but have taken positive action on the blowdown situation in the Pacific Northwest. In addition, the modest amendment in the Jones Act has been of considerable value to our Northwest shippers.

However, in my judgment, much remains to be done. It is my hope that the Northwest Senators will be able to get together in the very near future and outline a program of constructive action which will place us in a position where we can evaluate which of the several measures restricting imports

would be best calculated to be most effective and least onerous to other segments of our economy.

For example, I am concerned that the buy-American principle, if applied to FHA housing, would pose some problems for the homebuilding industry. I do not want to imply by this statement that I would oppose such a provision but I want to weigh most carefully whether it is something that I should urge at this time. My present feeling is that we may want to press for a somewhat more substantial quota than is suggested by your legislative staff, but again, I wish to evaluate this situation a little further.

In a separate letter I have discussed the right-of-way issue.

On the appeals procedure, I am informed there is an understanding between the Forest Service and your association that further action will be deferred until the small working party which has been discussing possible revisions of the Forest Service timber sale contract has completed its work and circulated its suggestions for broader industry approval.

On the wilderness legislation, I must be frank to state that my view here is that we should have such legislation. I would further say that if we in the Congress are going to have the time to take care of the basic economic problems confronting our lumber industry it is essential that we follow the pattern of last year's Senate-passed legislation which, in my judgment, provides for an adequate review of primitive areas and does not burden the Congress with approval of each and every one of them. As you know, the legislation definitely contemplates that there will be congressional approval on any new additions to the wilderness system. I think there is much merit in this suggestion since the wilderness legislation would come before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is composed mainly of western Senators who are from the heavy lumber producing regions of our Nation.

On Forest Service timber sale procedures, I am of the opinion that substantial progress is being made. On the first proposal made by your organization last year dealing with the management of national forest timber and annual reports, Secretary Freeman has taken the necessary action. On

timber appraisal matters, I am advised by the Department of Agriculture that a committee of three experts in the field will commence its review this March, soliciting cooperation of the industry as its proceeds in this complex technical subject. The third proposal in this category has already been discussed in my letter as has the fourth on which substantial progress, I am told, is being made.

I would like at this point to deal collectively with the two items you entitle "Wood Promotion" and "Lumber Grades and Standards." Expressions of concern have been voiced by a number of Northwest lumber producers on the question of lumber grades and standards. I believe that some improvements could be made in this field and the proposals that have been made seem to be pointed in this direction. On the other hand, I am inclined to agree with the people from the Northwest who have spoken to me on this issue, that a thorough study should be made before lumber grades and standards are changed and that we should have the best possible technical information at our disposal. Also, I think that it is essential that any new program of such broad dimensions be carefully analyzed before it is put into effect in order that we do not disrupt producers who are not presently geared to the manufacture of the type of lumber which would be more preferred under the suggested program.

On wood promotion, I believe there is a definite Government responsibility to be of positive assistance. For this reason, I would support an enlargement of the legislation that Senator Magnuson introduced last year which would allocate a part of our tariff collections from Canadian lumber to the benefit of the wood-using industry. One step which I think would be useful would be to allocate a portion of the tariff collection to checking the lumber grades and standards of incoming Canadian lumber. Even more important, I think, would be the allocation of a part of the funds to wood promotion and market development. In my judgment, the entire tariff collected should be placed at the disposal of the domestic lumber industry through a coordinated program operated by the proper agencies in the Federal Government.

I am especially interested in finding all of the constructive steps that can be taken domestically which will improve per capita consumption of lumber. I hope that the steps that I have outlined, limited though they may be, are indicative of the type of things which I think would be useful.

It is my hope that we will have an early report from the Secretary of Agriculture on the access matter and from the Secretary of the Treasury on the road use tax matter. When these reports arrive, I would like to schedule a meeting with you and your associates so that we may review exactly where we stand on the question of Canadian lumber imports and the condition of the domestic lumber industry.

The several draft bills which you submitted to me dealing with Canadian lumber imports on a restrictive basis have been introduced by Members of the Senate. The question, therefore, is now properly before the appropriate Senate committees. My judgment is that it will be necessary to decide which of these bills would be most effective, taken together with other constructive action, in dealing with the situation. In the final analysis, you can be assured of my support of whatever action is reasonable and proper.

Your views on the suggestions that I have made here would be most helpful. Your further suggestions at any time will certainly be welcome.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

WEST VERSUS SOUTH

To the Editor:

The February 13 edition of the Oregonian carried a letter from Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in which he sought to explain away the opposition of his organization to a proposed amendment to the Federal Wage and Hour Act that would require equal pay for women who do work equivalent to that performed by men. In his letter, Mr. Doyle purported to speak for lumbermen and the lumber industry.

There is a substantial segment of the lumber industry in the West that is not a part of Mr. Doyle's organization, that does not share Mr. Doyle's views, and for which Mr. Doyle certainly does not speak.

Canadian lumber, alone, is not the sole problem of the western lumber industry. Of equal concern is the southern pine industry, whose views on this occasion are reflected in Mr. Doyle's letter. The southern pine industry may not like Canadian lumber imports, but it likes even less the producers of lumber in the Western States. Hence, it is the southern pine industry that urges retention of the Jones Act whereby the Government prohibits west coast lumber producers from using available ships of foreign registry. This prevents west coast lumber producers from regaining their east coast markets. It is southern lumber producers, now joined by a few westerners, who are pressuring the Federal Government to discriminate against the sizes of lumber that our great water shipping mills produce and ship. And it is the southern mills that pay low wages and now resist efforts to see that women are paid fairly for the work they do.

Mr. Doyle says the core issue is whether individuals with limited skills should be forced into unemployment by a Government requirement for payment of high wages. Lumber manufacturers of Oregon and Washington pay decent hourly wages that enable families to live with the dignity of Amer-

ican citizens. We do not complain, but we cannot compete in the eastern and middle western lumber markets with manufacturers of southern pine who want to manufacture lumber with cheap labor.

Mr. Doyle's organization wants the Government to force the rejection of the products of our water shipping mills. But Government interferes too much, he says, when it compels a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Doyle speaks for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. He reflects accurately the wondrous views of the southern wing of that association. But he certainly does not speak for me or the many other western lumbermen like me.

SIDNEY LEIKEN,

Oregon State Representative and
President, L. & H. Lumber Co.

SUTHERLIN.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

BILL WOULD PLUG TIMBER TAX HOLE

(By Julius Duschka)

WASHINGTON.—A little-noticed provision in President Kennedy's tax program would plug a loophole that has provided big timber, lumber, and paper companies with hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits for nearly 20 years.

The loophole was placed in the law to encourage good forestry practices, but for the most part it has had the opposite effect.

Since 1944 all profits from the sale of timber have been treated as capital gains and taxed at the low capital gains rate of 25 percent.

When the capital gains rate was applied to all timber sales it was argued that small timber operators would benefit the most and that the change would foster good timber practices.

But large corporations have been the big beneficiaries. According to a Treasury Department study, they have used the provision to speed up the cutting of their timber holdings in a manner not conducive to the good forestry practices of selective cutting and reforestation.

Here are some examples from the Treasury study of the effects of the timber loopholes in 1959, the latest year for which complete figures are available.

In the timber industry, 3 companies received 42 percent of the \$44 million in tax benefits given timber operators, while 12 companies out of a total of 2,427 in the industry got more than half of the benefits.

In the plywood industry, 2 companies got more than 90 percent of the \$11 million in timber capital gains benefits received by the industry, 4 firms got all but 5 percent of the benefits and the other 1,400 firms in this industry received less than \$500,000 in capital gains benefits.

Of the 3,464 companies in the paper industry, the 15 largest ones got more than 82 percent of the timber capital gains benefits given that industry.

Before 1944 a farmer or timber grower who owned timber and cut it for his own business or who had someone harvest the timber under a cutting contract could not treat his profits as capital gains. To get the capital gains treatment the timber and the land had to be sold outright.

Under the best timber-cutting practices timber is harvested selectively and the land is carefully reforested so that over a period of years timber can become an annual crop.

But before 1944, the tax laws encouraged the outright sale of timber, which generally means the denuding of timberland, and penalized the careful cutting and reforestation practices.

A Treasury Department analysis of the timber capital gains provision points out

that lumber, pulp and paper companies buy timberlands to assure themselves a permanent supply of timber.

"For these buyers," the Department said, "capital gains treatment on a portion of their profit margin * * * is an essentially fortuitous tax advantage * * * this advantage bears little or no relationship to conservation and good forestry management."

The Treasury study also said that capital gains treatment for timber is "facilitating the wholesale cutting of accumulated timber stands in order quickly to pay off debt financing" and calls into "grave question the effect of this feature of the tax laws on resource conservation."

The President has asked Congress to remedy this situation by treating the timber income of corporations as ordinary income and limiting the capital gains treatment on timber to \$5 thousand annually in the case of individuals.

"This level of coverage * * * will still provide a full capital gain opportunity to over 99 percent of the forest land owners," the Treasury Department said.

EXHIBIT 6

MEMORANDUM ON THE LUMBER STANDARDS ISSUE

WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,

Portland, Ore., February 22, 1963.

The purpose of this report is to clarify issues and to discuss certain remarks as presented by Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, before the House of Representatives and as reported on page 2232 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1963. The subject pertains to proposed new lumber standards and the desire by a segment of the lumber industry to establish new dimensions for studs, joists, rafters, and other framing lumber.

It is important to place the controversy over lumber standards in its true economic perspective. The basic push for changed lumber standards stems from the difficult economic problems facing the lumber industry highlighted at this time by the controversy over increased imports from Canada. With the domestic demand for softwood lumber at a stationary low level and with a realization that the domestic demand for lumber will probably continue at this stationary low level for several more years, the proposed change in standards is a device being pushed by one segment of the lumber industry to gain significant competitive advantage over another segment of the lumber industry. The purpose of this competitive advantage is to protect existing domestic markets for one segment in the face of the onslaught of Canadian exports at the expense of another segment of the domestic lumber industry. The controversy on lumber standards was probably inevitable and stems directly from the economic difficulties forced by our industry.

Clearly, a major segment of the western lumber industry is not in favor of changed lumber sizes which have as a result the real possibility of tremendous economic hardship. Accordingly, Western Forest Industries Association has been and is opposed to the proposed changes in lumber sizes. However, Western Forest Industries Association is always ready to assess any proposed changes from the standpoint of facts. This memorandum will go into a factual analysis of the proposed changes. The method by which proposed new dimensions of lumber have been promulgated is open to serious challenge. The establishment of new dimensions for framing components must be tied to the ability of such dimensions to meet the strength and performance requirements specified by present span tables. The claimed ability of the new proposed dimen-

sions to meet these strength requirements has been premised upon the application of certain values for the shrinkage of lumber that have heretofore been casually accepted by producers and consumers of lumber. Acceptance of these values has been casual because of what has been a relative lack of their application to the everyday problems of manufacturing and using framing lumber. With the current attempt to compare new sizes for lumber to sizes that have been in use for many years the order of magnitude of shrinkage that occurs during the natural seasoning of lumber immediately gains new and important significance.

The values for shrinkage used in arriving at new recommended sizes for dimension lumber were provided by the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. In providing these values for shrinkage, the laboratory at Madison called upon its own resources of data and information that were derived through research activities conducted more than 25 years ago. The research work from which these data were obtained did not have as its objective the establishment of shrinkage values that would be applied to the determination of relative sizes and strength of lumber. Because this work had as its purpose the solution of another problem, the methods of procedure and the analysis of results were only indirectly related to the problem at hand. The determinations of shrinkage were based upon the amount of shrinkage that occurred at equilibrium moisture content of the test specimens. This is as opposed to the practical everyday use requirement of determining shrinkage at a condition of average moisture content throughout the cross section of a piece of lumber. Further departures from practical application of the research results are to be found in that drying conditions did not approximate those related to the natural seasoning of lumber and the test specimens were very small in size and represented limited and ideal conditions of wood structure. The procedure that was applied failed to give deserved consideration to geographic location of growth area, rapidity of growth, relationship of sapwood to heart wood, direction of grain, and proportion of summer wood to spring wood. These are factors that logically should be given close consideration by any program of research having as its objective the determination of shrinkage values to be applied with accuracy as a basis for recommending new product sizes for the lumber industry throughout the entire United States and to assure that those new sizes can satisfy the span tables as presently enforced by FHA.

A recent independent study (and the first of its kind for the present application) of the shrinkage of Douglas-fir lumber conducted under the auspices of the Western Forest Industries Association confirmed that the shrinkage values applied in arriving at the proposed new dimensions of lumber were roughly 100 percent greater than were developed during actual seasoning of lumber from a green condition (30 percent or above in moisture content) to an average moisture content value of 15 percent. The values of shrinkage applied were in the immediate vicinity of 4 percent whereas the values for shrinkage exposed by the independent study were found to be less than 2 percent. It should also be pointed out that the study referred to indicated a shrinkage value to 19 percent average moisture content of something over 1 percent. These seemingly small percentile figures gain economic significance when it is understood that 1-percent shrinkage amounts to ten one-thousandths of 1 inch per inch of lumber, or one sixty-fourth of 1 inch for lumber that is 1½ inches in thickness. The difference between 2-percent shrinkage and 4-percent shrinkage

represent one thirty-seconds of 1 inch of lumber. If the recommended new dimensions for lumber were adopted, it would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra one thirty-second of 1 inch of lumber for each nominal 2 inches of lumber thickness he shipped. The producer of dry lumber would be allowed to remove this amount of material from each piece of lumber and thus gain considerable benefit by reduction of his shipping weight. On the west coast alone, the impact of this upon the producer of green lumber will be to incur additional tens of millions of dollars per year in payment of freight as compared to the lower cost of shipping dry lumber of smaller dimension. This economic relationship between the shipment of dry and green lumber points up an absolute necessity for establishing accurate values for the shrinkage of wood during seasoning if indeed any change is made.

The importance of premising values for shrinkage of lumber upon the practical circumstances related to the manufacture and use of lumber cannot be overemphasized. The use of shrinkage values based upon the physical response of wood when drying to an equilibrium moisture content (the same moisture content throughout the entire cross section area) is academic and not applicable to the practical problem at hand. Shrinkage values must be based upon the determination of average moisture content for it is on the basis of average moisture that dried lumber is sized to its finished dimension. Also, the application of existing span tables is based upon average moisture conditions.

To relate new dimensions for lumber to an excessively high shrinkage value will, as explained, give the producer of dry framing lumber an economic advantage in his competitive position with green producers. What is not generally recognized is that this same high value for shrinkage, when applied to the relationship of dry to green sizes for lumber, can have a thoroughly detrimental effect upon the dry producer as well. Referring back to the significance of span tables, it is important to keep in mind that the tables that are presently accepted and in use have been derived through empirical means. They are not premised upon the actual physical testing of pieces of lumber, but they have been found adequate and applicable over a good number of years of use. A letter addressed to Mr. R. J. Canavan, Assistant FHA Commissioner, and written by Edward G. Locke, Director of the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory states, "Our calculations indicate that the proposed new dry sizes, 1½ inches in thickness and present ALS widths are equal or slightly greater in strength and stiffness than the present standard ALS sizes dressed green." This letter, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following Mr. BERRY's remarks, fails to state that the calculations mentioned were premised upon shrinkage values in the area of 4 percent. The shrinkage value used in the development of such calculations is vital. The calculations are evolved by relating an assumed piece of lumber of the desired size (machined dry) to the assumed shrunken size of a piece of lumber that had been machined when green. By using this comparative situation it is apparent that as the order of magnitude of shrinkage is increased, the assumed dry (15 percent moisture content) size of the piece that was sized when green will be increasingly smaller. By relating back to the practices of applying span tables now in use, it follows that whatever the dry (seasoned) size of a piece of lumber that was machined when green, it will have adequate strength to meet the requirements of the span tables. So, in relating the machined dry size to the shrunken dry size,

it becomes obvious that as the "calculated" shrunken size becomes smaller there will be an ever closer strength relationship between it and some arbitrarily selected smaller new size for dry dressed lumber.

The fact that the user of lumber has been completely ignored by the application of unrealistically high shrinkage values becomes evident as soon as it is realized that the recommended new dimensions for framing lumber seem to have been theoretically compared to an artificially small dry size for lumber that was dressed when green. This means that the strength of lumber sized when dry to the new recommended dimensions could well be below strength requirements as enforced today by FHA. Without a realistic value for shrinkage upon which to base calculations of strength, it is incongruous to say that the proposed new dry size of 1½ inches in thickness will meet the requirements of existing span tables.

Credence is given to the claimed lack of data and information concerning the shrinkage of lumber by the fact that the Forest Research Laboratory of the State of Oregon has undertaken a study of shrinkage of Douglas fir. This study was originally requested by the west coast lumber inspection bureau as a result of information brought to its attention that evidenced reasonable doubt as to the validity of applying the high shrinkage values used in the development of the proposed new sizes for framing lumber.

The same technical and economic information presented before WCLIB was exposed to the National Lumber Standards Subcommittee at its Chicago meeting on January 23 and 24. This exposure resulted in the committee postponing action on endorsement of the proposed 1½-inch dry lumber size pending further study and resolution of the percent of shrinkage of lumber during seasoning. Proposed size equivalents between green and dry lumber could not be acted upon because of the lack of applicable information and data upon which to establish a relationship.

On January 28 and 29, a group of spokesmen for a major segment of the western lumber industry that questions the proposed new sizes met with officials of FHA and the Office of Technical Standards, Department of Commerce, for the purpose of exposing the same information previously presented to WCLIB and ALS. It is partly on the basis of these meetings and the resulting exposure of true economic and technical facts that FHA has seen fit to withhold its approval of a 1½-inch size for dry lumber. When the Department of Commerce learned that the Forest Research Laboratory of Oregon had agreed to conduct a study of the shrinkage of lumber for the specific purpose of applying information derived to a logical determination of new sizes for lumber, it volunteered to support a technician to observe the conduct of the study. It was expected that this technical observer would be provided by the Madison Forest Products Laboratory and that the Department of Commerce would pay per diem and travel expenses for the individual. It was later learned that when the Madison Forest Products Laboratory was confronted by the Department of Commerce and FHA with a request for cooperation and the services of a qualified individual, the request was rejected.

That the forest research laboratory, an official activity of the State of Oregon, considers existing information concerning the shrinkage of lumber to be inadequate is evidenced by the fact that the laboratory is using State funds for the conduct of the current research study. It is expected that this study will reach a point that will yield significant results sometime toward the end of April. The study, incidentally, is premised upon a determination of the

shrinkage of lumber when it reaches various average moisture content values not an equilibrium moisture content value.

The accusation by Mr. BERRY that the Federal Housing Administration has become responsive to political pressure seems uncalled for in view of the serious technical discrepancies pointed out above. These discrepancies are obvious to anyone who studies the matter, as is an understanding of the economic impact imposed by these technical considerations. The inference that FHA presently accepts 1 1/16-inch lumber on an equal status with 1 1/8-inch lumber is incorrect. Span tables state specifically that 1 1/8-inch lumber can be used only under reduced strength values. In view of this, it seems incomprehensible that FHA would be expected to give consideration to accepting 1 1/16-inch lumber at a par for strength with 1 1/8-inch lumber. FHA is consistent in recognizing the fact that lumber thinner than 1 1/8-inch does not qualify under existing span tables.

With an understanding of the true nature of the problem of sizing lumber it is obvious that no change can be tolerated until exact technical information is developed and all of the manifestations of the problem at hand are on record. It follows that if the forest research laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., finds that shrinkage values at average moisture content are significantly below the shrinkage values applied in the development of new size recommendations, then the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., must undertake a comprehensive study of the shrinkage of framing lumber. Such a study must be applied to all commercially important species and must include considerations of the natural variability of wood, its physical structure, its growth location, and the size of the pieces being tested.

The problem of strength of wood by species and sizes is of overriding importance in terms of ability of consumers to specify lumber for its various uses with assurance that lumber will adequately do the job. The Western Forest Industries Association has been studying intensively the existing status of information being used by the Government bearing on the question of existing span tables and strength ratings for various species and sizes of lumber. While our information is not yet complete it would appear that the present span tables and strength determinations are not based on actual tests of the strength of lumber presently being used by the American consumer. If our investigation bears out that we do not have existing studies to support the strength characteristics for softwood lumber, then clearly we will insist that such studies be conducted and completed prior to any changes in lumber standards or sizes which carry with them such tremendous economic significance both to the manufacturers of lumber and the consumer.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee at the January meeting in Chicago adopted a position that in determining the shrinkage values for naturally seasoned lumber shrinkage should be determined to an average moisture content of 15 percent. The 15 percent figure was adopted on the assumption that kiln dried framing lumber in the West was in fact dried on the average to 15 percent moisture content. Again no reliable statistical data confirms this assumption. Western Forest Industries Association is now engaged in an intensive analysis of the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber on the west coast. If our research should indicate that the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber is higher than 15 percent, we will then insist that shrinkage factors be applied to that higher percentage.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee also adopted a recommendation that the grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber be changed so that kiln dried lumber will have a maximum moisture content of 19 percent. Existing grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber provide for a maximum of 19 percent moisture content with an allowance that 10 percent of the pieces can be up to 25 percent moisture content. If this recommendation is adopted by the American Lumber Standard Committee in May, the dry lumber manufacturers in the West will be economically disadvantaged in relation to the producers of southern lumber. Such a proposal would add to the costs of producing dry lumber in the West.

We hope it is clear from this memorandum that Western Forest Industries Association and the Government agencies involved in this question are concerned with the facts and will insist upon adequate facts where such facts are not today available. Once the facts are determined we can then make meaningful decisions. It is the National Lumber Manufacturers Association who tried to railroad a change in size standards based upon inadequate factual information. As the inadequate base of NLMA's facts came to light and the Government agencies decided accordingly to not act in haste, National Lumber Manufacturers Association decided apparently to make a political issue of the matter with the obvious purpose of trying to politically force the Government to adopt its proposals. Representative BERRY's remarks on the floor of the House may reflect the start of this political pressure.

EXHIBIT 7

[From The Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

ICC GROUP APPROVES REDUCED RATES ON LUMBER SHIPMENTS BY RAILROADS

WASHINGTON.—A 3-member division of the Interstate Commerce Commission Thursday approved reduced rates on railroad shipments of lumber from Pacific coast to eastern points.

The decision which may be appealed to the full 11-man Commission, was regarded as a major victory for railroad interests in their fight with water barge owners for the lumber shipping business.

The ICC division approved a reduction of 7 cents per 100 pounds on lumber and related items shipped from the west coast to the east, provided shipments are made in minimum carload units of at least 55,000, 70,000, or 75,000 pounds—depending on type of car used.

Present minimum weight requirements involved in lumber shipping charges are 38,000, 44,000, and 54,000 pounds.

An example of the effect of the decision is the lowering of the \$1.61 rate to \$1.54 a 100 pounds of lumber shipped from Portland, Oreg. to New York City.

Joining intercoastal water carriers in opposing the reduction were southern and southwestern lumber producers and some port of New York interests.

The water carriers contended the reduced rates would be lower than necessary to meet competition. Railroads said the proposed rates were intended to encourage heavier carloadings, rather than to drive water carriers out of the lumber shipping business.

The differentials between the new rail rates and water carrier rates "are less than those found to be necessary and proper in some rail-water competitive rate cases," the ICC division said.

But any greater differential would "hobble" the railroads, which have an inherent advantage in lumber shipping, and would impair "their ability to transport the exist-

ing volume of rail lumber traffic at lower rates while increasing their net revenues," the division said.

In Portland, Ken Batchelder, traffic manager of West Coast Lumbermen's Association, said the rate reduction would mean a savings of \$20 million a year for western lumber shippers.

He said the rate has been in effect since December of 1961 but has been under fire from southern pine lumber interests.

Western pine, Douglas Fir Plywood Association, California Redwood Association, and the WCLA participated in the initial battle to get the rate reduction and have since been active in defending it, Batchelder stated.

EXHIBIT 8

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of Commerce, Feb. 15, 1963]

FREEHOLD SERVICES AND LUMBER

Distance from midwestern and eastern markets has always been a problem to producers in the Pacific Northwest, and this is particularly true when bulky products, such as lumber and other wood products, are involved.

Regulatory groups have the problem of striking a balance between an industry which is very sensitive to freight rates, and transportation, which seems to have a chronic condition resulting from a variety of reasons.

The Jones Act was formulated to aid American water shipping, and not until the act had completely eliminated services to some areas was the act modified.

In order to aid the railroads, the historical hold services which railroads granted western lumber shippers was dropped. Now, with the pinch from Canadian lumber competition, lack of this service is proving detrimental to those who ship western forest products by rail, and particularly the smaller operators. As a result the Western Lumber Marketing Association sought to have reinstated, on a reduced scale, the hold services.

Last week this was denied by the Western Railroad Traffic Association. In Portland this week Hersh M. Tanzer, WLMA president, dealt with the subject, and possible results of the denial, at some length.

There seems little doubt that if the competition from Canadian lumber continues, many of the small mills face a problem which may be insurmountable. The hold services are a definite marketing aid.

Reduction of lumber shipments cannot work to the advantage of railroads, and failure to restore limited freehold services on eastbound shipments may well reduce the railroads' share of lumber shipments. The Jones Act, designed to aid American shipping, almost eliminated waterborne lumber cargoes; failure to make modification in rail tariffs could have the same effect upon lumber shipments by rail.

EXHIBIT 9

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Feb. 12, 1963]

MARKETING ADVANTAGES SAID LOST TO LUMBER

Another one of the lumber marketing advantages has disappeared with the recent decision of the Western Railroad Traffic Association turning down the 5-day freehold of transit operators. This was emphasized by Hersh M. Tanzer, Portland, vice president, Buckeye-Pacific Lumber Co. and Western Lumber Marketing Association president, at a Tuesday press conference at the Benson Hotel.

"This is a tremendous compromise on the part of the shippers from the railroad services that had been standard for 80-odd years,"

Tanzer told the Portland Reporter. "We felt that this tariff would finalize the long struggle and prolong bickering that has taken place within the industry and resolve the issue in a final and fixed tariff with which all parties could live and which would be a great service to our industry. We felt that this would bring order out of a confused situation."

The proposal which was turned down by the WRTA executive committee requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at a \$3-per-day charge. Regular penalty demurrage would go into effect at the expiration of this time.

Lyle Baker, editor of the Lyle Baker Reports, KPTV, explained that while there has been abuses of transit privileges he and other western lumber industry representatives feel that the railroad industry has gone too far in eliminating a marketing tool which is of vital necessity to certain industry segments.

Roland Wirt, Portland, WLMA traffic commission chairman, said, "If western rail lumber is to compete with other producing sections of the country some marketing assistance of a definite nature is necessary."

EXHIBIT 10

[From the Portland Reporter, Feb. 16, 1963]

GIVE SMALL OPERATORS A BREAK

A decision has been made affecting the Northwest lumber industry as important, in an adverse way, as the Jones Act revision was in a positive sense.

It is the recent decision of the executive committee of the Western Railroad Traffic Association to deny tariff application No. 60-1 for restoration of limited freehold services on eastbound shipments of western forest products.

WLMA's proposal requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at \$3 per day charge. At the expiration of this time, regular penalty demurrage would go into effect.

The request was supported by over 250 American lumber manufacturers and over 200 midwestern and eastern wholesalers, jobbers and retailers of lumber products. They argued the historical hold services, which railroads have granted western lumber shippers for 80 years and were instrumental in keeping western products competitive, should be reinstated.

Hershal M. Tanzer, WLMA president, stated: "This rejection has dealt a severe blow to hundreds of small and middle-size mills who need every bit of support and assistance possible to remain competitive in a market in which Canadian exports are increasing and in which cost factors are rising. It is ironic to note that on the very date that the first foreign vessel loaded with lumber from an American port for Puerto Rico under Jones Act modification, an act of assistance for the large water mills, the WRTA rejected this vital rail proposal which would have granted a significant measure of assistance to hundreds of smaller mills who must ship by rail rather than by water."

The rail group's executive committee disapproved: Any hold period free of charge; the restriction on granting any hold period with or without charge to lower grade cars; the restriction on any hold period, with or without charge, to cars not over 40 feet 6 inches in length and doors not to exceed 6 feet in width, under tariff provisions which would permit of no substitution of equipment.

The committee did, however, leave one loophole, stating: It is impossible at this time to arrive at any conclusion as to

whether a hold period could be granted, subject to any particular detention charge, until final decision is made upon proposals now pending before the Association of American Railroads for per diem charges graduated upon age and condition of cars. Therefore any further action was held in abeyance until such a decision is reached.

WLMA spokesmen, however, feel any decision on per diem charges is an idle dream. It has been, and will be, discussed for years. For all practical purposes, WLMA's request is denied.

Railroads, of course, traditionally have objected to tying up cars in transit, though their policy is not always consistent in that such services are still granted grain and coal shippers and hold services and lower demurrage rates are maintained for lumber shipments destined for export by water.

Railroads say shippers' use of cars in transit, in effect, supplies them with warehouses, a charge the smaller shippers cheerfully admit. The small shippers say they lack the capital to build extensive warehouse facilities, that in-transit selling gets products on the way quickly, it has been traditional, and it helps keep little operators in competition with the giants.

Both sides in the controversy present valid arguments. But with lumbering facing a declining and more competitive market, it would appear there is merit in reinstating the time-honored practice. Railroads likewise are experiencing financial troubles and they might well be advised to take a less discriminatory look at problems of the medium and small lumber firms.

Anything which will benefit the rapidly disappearing little businessman will in turn benefit the railroads. The conclusion that lack of cooperation will help only the big operators, who don't have to worry about warehouse costs is hard to ignore.

We think the WLMA's request has merit.

EXHIBIT 11

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregon Journal, Feb. 13, 1963]

WLMA STUDIES FREEHOLD ALTERNATIVES

(By Paul Manley)

Introduction by the Nation's railroads of expedited schedules for forest products—guaranteeing delivery at their destination at a specified time—may someday supersede the present practice of transiting in the lumber industry.

This hope was extended Tuesday to members of the Western Lumber Marketing Association by their president, Hershal M. Tanzer, in the wake of a setback for the organization's efforts to restore limited freehold privileges on eastbound shipments of forest products.

The WLMA had petitioned the Western Railroad Traffic Association to allow 5 days' freehold on carloads of lumber destined for points in the East, with an additional 7 days' storage at \$3 per day.

Denial of the petition refocused attention on the plight of the lumber wholesalers and small sawmill operators who constitute the membership of the WLMA. They had become accustomed to the practice of seeking buyers for their lumber while it was aboard boxcars en route to the East, and if they didn't line up a purchaser immediately, they could count on 15 days of free storage in the rail car while they shopped around. Last year the freehold practice was ordered discontinued.

Tanzer pointed out Tuesday that many agricultural products other than lumber enjoy expedited schedules, enabling shippers to accept firm delivery contracts, and suggested that application of this practice on

forest products consignments might relieve small western mills of the necessity of transiting.

He contended that lack of a definite delivery date actually fosters the practice of starting carloads of lumber rolling eastward without a specific destination, because the frequently lengthy travel time makes it practical to line up a buyer while the cargo is in transit.

Tanzer said elimination of the freehold has forced WLMA members to use "what circuitous routings are legitimately available" and to do a greater portion of their business on firm orders.

But he defended in-transit selling as "one of the most successful and efficient methods of getting western lumber to market."

"It has been an important factor in making forest products more accessible and attractive in the consuming area of the Midwest and East," the WLMA president maintained. "It has been an important method of keeping western production competitive with lumber from Southern States, which is already close to its consuming market."

"I know of no other commodity that has such a high percentage of distribution cost," Tanzer added, estimating that about 40 percent of the cost of western lumber in eastern markets is represented by freight charges, against 15 to 20 percent for southern pine.

He also claimed that rejection of the freehold renewal application "will make the purchase of lumber from many Canadian origins more attractive to the American buyer."

Tanzer expressed the belief that the railroads, by refusing to adopt a modified freehold, are opening the door to stepped-up competition from trucklines for lumber traffic.

He said this would become evident as the highway system is improved and as lumber buyers become more fussy about deliveries.

He predicted a major break, sooner or later in the Jones Act restrictions to allow foreign vessels to carry lumber between ports in the United States, and speculated that when this takes place it will be cheaper to ship lumber by water to the east coast and then backhaul it hundreds of miles by truck than it will be to route the same cargo from mill to market entirely by rail.

"Even today it costs more to ship lumber from Portland to New York by rail than it does by water," he observed.

The WLMA president deplored the operation of warehouses in the East and Midwest by large integrated lumber producers contending that the practice increases distribution costs, which ultimately are passed on to the consumer.

For this reason he rejected a suggestion that WLMA members pool their marketing efforts through central warehouses, claiming it would be neither efficient nor economical, and the additional handling would raise the cost to the consumer.

Indicating that the search will continue for alternatives to the freehold, Tanzer stressed, "None of us are going out of business."

EXHIBIT 12

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Feb. 17, 1963]

UP TO CONGRESS

The U.S. lumber industry never had much of a chance of obtaining Government restrictions on Canadian lumber imports. Such quotas violate the free-trade policy President Kennedy urges and preceding administrations supported. And, besides, Canada buys much more of all goods from the United States than we buy from her.

If the U.S. Tariff Commission had not rejected the request for lumber quotas on

the ground it was not proved increasing imports were caused in major part by past tariff concessions, chances are some other reason would have been found.

The U.S. lumbermen's best hope for relief from serious Canadian competition now lies with Congress. A bill already introduced would require all FHA-financed construction projects use U.S.-made lumber. Whether this is sound legislation may be open to argument. But there are restrictions, placed by law or regulation, on American lumber, such as the Jones Act and perhaps too extreme requirements for investments in harvesting Government timber, which could be eased. The Jones Act was modified slightly by Congress last year to permit shipping lumber to Puerto Rico in foreign vessels. If shipping to Atlantic coast ports could also be by other than American-flag ships, a considerable advantage now held by Canadian tidewater mills would vanish.

Of course, the U.S. industry is not of one mind as to what form relief should take. Small Northwest mills that ship by rail and sell in transit wish reinstatement of freehold privileges on railroads which were abolished recently after 80 years. This freehold was for 15 days. Last week, the Western Railroad Traffic Association denied a compromise proposal, that a hold time of 5 days, with 7 additional days at \$3 a day, be granted. Canada dropped its 15-day freehold under pressure last year. But officials of the Western Lumber Marketing Association contend this did not put small western lumbermen back in a competitive position with Canadians. Lumber from many Canadian origins remains more attractive to American buyers, they say.

Large mills, which have their own distribution facilities, are opposed to freeholds, which permit their smaller competitors to use freight cars for storage. There are also many differences of opinion between western and southern producers.

What the lumber industry needs most of all is a boom in home building. If there were a brisk demand for lumber, there would be little worry about Canadian competition. Even now some operators are doing well, as annual reports prove.

One can expect continued pressure on Congress for needed remedial legislation, more squabbling among the various segments of the industry itself and continued concentration of lumbering into large, integrated plants better equipped to achieve full utilization of the log.

EXHIBIT 13

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER SALE ACTIVITIES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1962

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

This report has been prepared in response to Senator MAGNUSON's request expressed in his statement to the Senate on June 12, 1962.

The timber harvest of 9.6 billion board feet in 1962 is the highest rate of cutting yet obtained in any calendar year on the national forests. It exceeds the previous record high year of 1959 by 300 million board feet. The attainment of this new record during a year when domestic lumber production was at a relatively low ebb is particularly gratifying. For the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, timber harvesting totaled 600 million board feet more than for the same period in the preceding year. This accelerated rate of cutting is indicative of a new record for calendar year 1963 in excess of 10 billion board feet.

The tables in this report show for each national forest allowable cutting rates, cut

and sell objectives used in the allotment of timber sale funds to each national forest, the actual volumes cut and sold and the backlog of timber under contract on December 31, 1962. Also shown is the volume of timber offered but not sold and average prices at which timber was advertised and average prices at which it was sold.

Since accomplishment goals from timber sale funds made available to each national forest are set by fiscal years, it has been necessary to assume that the planned rate of cutting and sales for calendar year 1962 is equal to one-half of the established goals for fiscal year 1962 and one-half for fiscal year 1963. Over a series of years, this assumption will average out. It is not precisely correct for a single year. A high rate of sales activity is scheduled for the last half of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, particularly on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This sales activity for this current 6-month period is expected to bring sales up to planned goals on the 42 national forest group. On the other national forests, the possibility of catching up on indicated sales accomplishment below goals will be dependent upon local markets.

The first table in the report is a special summary of the situation on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This is a group of forests to which special attention and analysis was given in the forest service statement to the Senate Commerce Committee on June 15, 1962. These 42 national forests account for approximately 75 percent of the allowable cut for saw logs.

Details for every national forest are shown in the series of tables following this summary table. The full statement for each forest is presented in two adjoining sheets. A discussion of the highlights shown by these records follows the table presentation.

This report is the first of a planned series of annual reports on timber sale activities. The Forest Service will be glad to have comments or suggestions for arrangement or subject coverage which would make the report more useful in subsequent years.

HIGHLIGHTS FOR 1962

The 42-national-forest area

The first table of this report summarizes timber sale activities on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical.

During calendar year 1962, the actual cut of 7,032.7 million board feet amounted to 98 percent of the allowable cut as of January 1, 1962, and represented 98 percent of planned work. A volume of 7,112.5 million board feet was sold. This is 99 percent of the annual allowable cut and 92 percent of the planned sell. In addition 145.3 million board feet or 2 percent was advertised, but not sold.

There are some variations from the overall levels of accomplishment that indicate local problems. For example, both sales and cutting are depressed on the Clearwater National Forest in north Idaho because construction of a major road into the North Fork Clearwater River is not yet completed. Accelerated construction to provide access in this area is scheduled for fiscal year 1964. Volume cut on the St. Joe National Forest in Idaho has declined because a major producer shifted cutting from that forest to company-owned and other private and State lands.

Cut and sell accomplishments in California have been variable by forests due in part to

changing plans of local operators. On the Sequoia National Forest planned sales have been delayed because of issues raised by organizations opposed to timber cutting on portions of the forest. It is expected that this controversy will be settled in time so that the planned sale offerings for fiscal year 1963 will be made before June 30. On the Tahoe National Forest a cut of approximately 50 million board feet in excess of allowable cut rates was expected to result from salvage of timber burned in the last 2 preceding years. The salvage amount proved to be less than anticipated. Cut volume on the Stanislaus National Forest was only 46 percent of planned volume because two major mills were strike bound.

Adjustment of programs on the national forests of Oregon and Washington, and to a lesser extent in northern California, have been necessary to meet the blowdown situation caused by the October 12, 1962 storm. These adjustments are not reflected in the tabulations for calendar year 1962. An accelerated program of salvage sales is now underway which will meet or exceed previously planned sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963.

Those national forests having a backlog of timber uncut under contract at least twice the annual allowable cut are considered to be in good condition from a sales standpoint. In the 42 forest area, 14 national forests have built up such backlogs. This indicates a need for an expanded sales program on the remaining 28 national forests. For the 42 national forests as a group, the uncut volume under contract equals 1.7 times the annual allowable cut.

The annual allowable cut for the 42 national forests was increased from 7,159 million board feet to 7,706 million board feet on October 12, 1962. These increases will be taken into account in scheduling sale objectives for fiscal year 1964.

General performance in the 42-national-forest area is considered satisfactory though improvement is needed in a few localized situations. The rate of sales during the period January 1 to June 30, 1963, is such that sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963 generally will be achieved.

National forests outside the 42-national-forest area

There are 112 national forests outside of the 42-national-forest area. Insofar as timber production is concerned, these 112 forests can be grouped into the Rocky Mountain and Intermountain States; the Southwest; the Lake States, Northeast and Southern States; and Alaska. The allowable cut for these 112 national forests is 4.1 billion board feet or 37 percent of the total allowable cut as of January 1, 1962. This includes pulpwood and other products of less than saw-log size for the national forests east of the Great Plains. The 2.6 billion board feet cut in 1962 amounted to 27 percent of the total volume harvested from all national forests.

Rocky Mountain and Intermountain National Forests

Lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce and Douglas-fir are the predominant species on this group of forests. In addition, there are substantial stands of ponderosa pine in the Black Hills of South Dakota, in southwestern Colorado and on the Dixie National Forest in Utah. In general, this timber is small in size, low in value, and remote from centers of lumber consumption. The rate of lumbering activity is strongly affected by the price swings of the lumber market. Local industries have experienced considerable difficulty in maintaining profitable production during 1962. Appraised timber prices are relatively low and there is little competi-

tive bidding. Installed milling capacity is generally less than permissible allowable cut rates. Additional timber access roads are needed to expand current cutting rates. The rate of sales in 1962 was lower than anticipated because of adverse market conditions. Uncut timber under contract is generally ample and averages more than twice allowable cutting rates. Progress toward marketing the full allowable cut is dependent upon improved markets and increased accessibility through timber access road construction.

Southwestern area

Ponderosa pine is the predominant species in New Mexico and Arizona. Installed milling capacity and allowable cuts are generally approximately in balance. The adequacy of timber supply for mills in this area is demonstrated by nominal competition for national forest timber sale offerings. Timber quality is lower than for ponderosa pine of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States. For a variety of economic reasons, the lumber industry of the Southwest has operated on rather narrow margins and is strongly affected by the swing in lumber prices. Because of these factors, sales and

cutting in 1962 were not as high as anticipated. Saw log timber under contract but not yet cut is approximately double allowable cut rates. Substantial cutting on a large pulpwood sale to the first pulpmill in the Southwest began in 1962. Sales in this area can be maintained at a rate adequate to supply existing industry. Expansion of sales and cutting rates is dependent primarily on a recovery in the lumber market.

Lake States, northeast and southern forests

In the forests east of the Great Plains, there are substantial markets for material less than saw-log size, primarily for pulpwood. Because of such markets, a separate calculation of allowable cut for material of less than saw-log size is established. This amounts to the equivalent of more than one billion board feet. It was possible to market only 56 percent of this allowable cut in 1962.

In the areas east of the Great Plains, national forest timber is generally a minor portion of the total timber resources available to local plants. During 1962 many purchasers either reduced cutting or shifted operations to other timber ownerships. As

a result, the rate of cutting was 89 percent of the anticipated rate. Ninety-seven percent of the planned sales were offered but approximately 200 million board feet or 12 percent of such offerings were not purchased.

Approximately 8 percent of the total allowable cut in this broad area is not yet considered to be marketable. This is primarily hardwood material of less than saw log size, which is not yet in demand by pulpmills. A rise in sale and cutting activity to the levels which had been planned for in 1962 is dependent upon market recovery for lumber and other forest products.

Alaska

Approximately 40 percent of the allowable cut for the national forests in Alaska is now being harvested. The primary markets for this material are the two major pulpmills now in operation. Cutting and sales activity in Alaska in 1962 were substantially on schedule. A major increase in the timber harvesting program is dependent upon additional pulpmill installation. Capacities of the two existing plants have been increased, but there appears to be no immediate prospect for installation of additional pulp plants in Alaska.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the 42 national forests of the Pacific coast and inland empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical, calendar year 1962

Region and State	National forest	Allowable cut of saw-timber, Jan. 1, 1962	Financed cut, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Financed sell, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Advertised, not sold	Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962	Average appraised price	Average sold price
			Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished	Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished				
Region 1: Idaho												
	Clearwater	211	121.0	98.7	82	142.5	63.5	45		248.9	\$2.37	\$4.50
	Coeur d'Alene	151	131.0	145.4	111	149.0	123.9	83		191.7	4.85	5.98
	Kaniksuk	140	133.5	145.2	109	165.0	105.4	117		313.6	4.72	7.28
	Nezperce	112	87.0	81.1	93	113.5	130.5	117		282.5	2.73	6.25
	St. Joe	100	67.5	47.8	71	88.0	110.8	126	4.2	251.4	3.47	3.97
Montana	Flathead	137	128.4	129.7	101	137.5	146.4	106		214.1	4.46	13.01
	Kootenai	185	167.5	168.4	101	191.5	163.2	85	13.0	302.9	2.46	5.31
	Lolo	162	110.5	113.9	103	147.5	195.0	132	1.0	240.3	3.64	6.39
Washington	Colville	80	62.5	71.2	114	103.0	103.5	100		167.5	4.04	7.23
Subtotal		1,278	1,008.9	1,001.4	99	1,237.5	1,230.2	99	18.2	2,212.9		
Region 4: Idaho												
	Boise	130	135.0	141.9	105	132.5	87.7	66	4.6	145.2	5.61	9.19
	Payette	91	80.3	65.6	82	134.9	63.7	47	13.2	185.5	4.05	4.65
Subtotal		221	215.3	207.5	96	267.4	151.4	57	17.8	330.7		
Region 5: California												
	Eldorado	116	102.9	74.5	72	130.4	112.7	86	5.9	97.0	7.73	15.48
	Klamath	185	200.7	161.7	81	219.2	153.9	70		206.7	4.85	6.73
	Lassen	99	107.8	109.3	101	114.1	67.4	59		127.1	9.53	16.10
	Mendocino	81	95.7	73.0	76	102.8	79.5	77		78.0	3.96	4.75
	Modoc	51	57.7	48.4	84	67.1	74.2	111		88.0	6.65	10.83
	Plumas	183	193.6	151.8	78	201.6	209.0	104	.3	247.2	10.66	14.35
	Sequoia	101	63.5	39.5	62	90.8	10.0	11	16.9	172.3	6.46	6.46
	Shasta-Trinity	218	221.7	210.1	95	249.7	286.0	115	.6	322.7	10.73	15.92
	Sierra	114	115.2	154.9	134	138.4	117.9	85	18.2	119.5	5.54	7.21
	Six Rivers	156	141.7	133.1	94	179.9	201.4	112	4.7	255.0	9.52	13.73
	Stanislaus	123	128.2	59.4	46	135.4	135.9	100		103.3	7.08	8.38
	Tahoe	130	186.7	123.5	66	108.6	77.4	71		70.0	7.09	13.19
Subtotal		1,557	1,615.4	1,339.2	83	1,738.0	1,525.3	88	46.6	1,913.8		
Region 6: Oregon												
	Deschutes	136	136.7	136.2	100	158.5	102.7	65		259.1	12.77	16.93
	Fremont	126	128.7	91.4	71	103.7	160.2	154	20.8	204.1	14.23	14.41
	Malheur	171	162.3	142.6	83	140.3	193.9	138		333.4	8.61	8.82
	Mount Hood	315	351.7	369.9	103	305.1	334.2	110		560.0	12.94	21.64
	Ochoco	98	121.6	140.2	115	73.1	35.4	48	.3	143.0	7.25	9.56
	Rogue River	126	164.7	209.1	127	174.0	181.3	104		158.8	11.89	15.83
	Siskiyou	179	183.4	177.2	97	188.8	152.3	81		277.6	13.64	18.54
	Siuslaw	327	359.4	345.9	96	318.4	330.4	104	.2	433.6	20.86	25.57
	Umatilla	129	124.4	109.4	88	117.5	93.2	79		280.2	7.99	11.28
	Umpqua	340	352.6	386.1	109	339.5	424.2	125		807.8	15.36	18.74
	Wallowa-Whitman	160	135.0	117.5	87	173.6	162.6	94	13.8	244.8	7.05	7.48
	Willamette	566	599.2	812.5	136	593.3	637.9	108		987.2	15.71	23.68
	Winema	90	100.4	74.8	74	119.8	161.7	135		403.7	14.08	19.84
Washington	Gifford Pinchot	395	475.8	442.8	93	506.8	433.2	85	3.5	925.5	11.20	19.50
	Mount Baker	201	236.4	226.8	96	217.9	209.7	96		438.0	5.07	11.19
	Okanogan	90	77.4	83.0	107	118.0	115.1	98	3.2	98.0	6.48	7.44
	Olympic	341	293.5	273.4	93	377.4	186.1	49		881.2	6.62	8.49
	Snoqualmie	207	221.3	222.6	101	352.0	183.9	52	19.6	433.7	13.39	18.55
	Wenatchee	106	134.0	123.2	92	117.1	107.6	92	1.3	174.5	8.56	9.83
Subtotal		4,103	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	4,494.8	4,205.6	94	62.7	8,069.2		
Grand total		7,159	7,198.1	7,032.7	98	7,737.7	7,112.5	92	145.3	12,526.6		

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962

(Millions of board feet)

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplishment				Planned	Accomplishment	
Region 1:																			
Clearwater.....	158.0		158.0	211.0		211.0	212.0		212.0	66.0	55.0	121.0	98.7	82	65.0	77.5	142.5	63.5	48
Coeur d'Alene.....	127.0		127.0	151.0		151.0	145.0		145.0	66.5	64.5	131.0	145.4	111	73.5	75.5	149.0	123.9	83
Kaniksu.....	132.0		132.0	140.0		140.0	147.0		147.0	66.0	67.5	133.5	145.2	109	82.5	82.5	165.0	193.4	117
Nezperce.....	98.0		98.0	112.0		112.0	110.0		110.0	45.0	42.0	87.0	81.1	93	60.0	53.5	113.5	130.5	115
St. Joe.....	52.0		52.0	100.0		100.0	99.0		99.0	37.5	30.0	67.5	47.8	71	42.5	45.5	88.0	110.8	126
Beaverhead.....	35.4		35.4	35.4		35.4	36.4		36.4	5.0	5.5	10.5	6.3	60	12.5	2.5	15.0	5.7	38
Bitterroot.....	26.0		26.0	26.0		26.0	45.7		45.7	20.0	22.5	42.5	76.8	181	32.5	23.5	56.0	34.1	61
Custer.....	10.2		10.2	18.2		18.2	18.2		18.2	1.4	1.5	2.9	1.6	55	3.3	7.5	10.8	1.8	17
Deerlodge.....	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	10.0	10.5	20.5	11.6	57	13.0	13.0	26.0	2.0	8
Flathead.....	116.0		116.0	137.0		137.0	136.0		136.0	65.0	63.4	128.4	129.7	101	67.5	70.0	137.5	146.4	106
Gallatin.....	43.0		43.0	47.0		47.0	49.9		49.9	12.5	12.0	24.5	32.9	134	27.5	25.0	52.5	44.5	85
Helena.....	35.7		35.7	35.7		35.7	36.5		36.5	10.0	9.5	19.5	17.0	87	27.5	22.5	50.0	24.0	48
Kootenai.....	164.0		164.0	185.0		185.0	182.0		182.0	85.0	82.5	167.5	168.4	101	95.0	96.5	191.5	163.2	85
Lewis and Clark.....	52.5		52.5	56.2		56.2	57.5		57.5	6.7	7.5	14.2	20.2	142	15.0	7.5	22.5	14.6	65
Lolo.....	157.0		157.0	162.0		162.0	162.0		162.0	58.0	52.5	110.5	113.9	103	75.0	72.5	147.5	195.0	132
Colville.....	68.0		68.0	80.0		80.0	79.0		79.0	32.5	30.0	62.5	71.2	114	55.0	48.0	103.0	103.5	100
Total.....	1,313.8		1,313.8	1,535.5		1,535.5	1,555.2		1,555.2	587.1	556.4	1,143.5	1,167.8	102	747.3	723.0	1,470.3	1,356.9	92
Region 2:																			
Arapaho.....	21.5		21.5	21.5		21.5	28.5		28.5	9.0	9.0	18.0	25.7	143	18.5	20.5	39.0	19.6	50
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre.....	17.5		17.5	17.5		17.5	40.0		40.0	9.0	7.0	16.0	10.5	66	22.5	25.0	47.5	10.2	21
Gunnison.....	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	5.0	4.0	9.0	2.0	22	27.5	25.5	53.0	2.8	5
Pike.....	4.6		4.6	4.6		4.6	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.5	4.5	3.3	73	2.0	5.5	7.5	1.3	17
Rio Grande.....	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	12.5	5.0	17.5	10.3	59	22.0	20.5	42.5	34.4	81
Roosevelt.....	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	28.3		28.3	5.0	4.0	9.0	11.6	129	11.5	17.5	29.0	5.4	19
Routt.....	32.7		32.7	50.7		50.7	50.7		50.7	13.5	11.5	25.0	29.8	119	27.0	32.5	59.5	49.8	84
San Isabel.....	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.7	92	6.5	2.5	9.0	1.8	20
San Juan.....	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	38.4	77	76.0	85.0	161.0	184.9	84
White River.....	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	38.8		38.8	6.5	5.0	11.5	11.3	98	37.5	11.5	49.0	32.4	66
Nebraska.....										.5	.2	.7	.6	86	1.5	.5	2.0	.8	40
Black Hills.....	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	32.5	25.0	57.5	49.1	85	32.5	50.0	82.5	58.1	70
Bighorn.....	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	7.5	4.0	11.5	4.6	40	29.0	15.0	44.0	3.9	9
Medicine Bow.....	50.0		50.0	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	25.0	20.0	45.0	30.9	69	59.5	25.5	85.0	7.1	8
Shoshone.....	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	6.0	5.5	11.5	16.7	145	19.0	17.5	36.5	37.5	103
Total.....	363.7		363.7	391.8		391.8	464.8		464.8	161.0	129.7	290.7	248.5	85	392.5	354.5	747.0	400.0	54
Region 3:																			
Apache.....	69.7		69.7	68.7		68.7	68.7		68.7	39.1	43.0	82.1	50.5	62	9.2	7.9	17.1	3.4	20
Coconino.....	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	31.6	42.2	73.8	66.6	90	29.2	29.1	58.3	14.1	24
Coronado.....	6.0		6.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	1.4	35	2.0	1.5	3.5	1.3	37
Kaibab.....	44.3		44.3	54.0		54.0	54.0		54.0	31.4	35.0	66.4	45.9	69	24.5	19.8	44.3	33.8	76
Prescott.....	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.5	2.2	4.7	3.0	64	2.9	2.2	5.1	15.9	312
Sitgreaves.....	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	34.8	37.5	72.3	76.4	106	7.2	14.4	21.6	15.8	73
Tonto.....	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	5.4	8.5	13.9	15.1	109	.7	.4	1.1	2.1	191
Carson.....	21.9		21.9	29.7		29.7	29.7		29.7	25.8	31.1	56.9	18.5	33	6.0	4.0	10.0	21.5	215
Cibola.....	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	4.5	3.0	7.5	4.9	65	5.0	3.2	8.2	6.5	79
Gila.....	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	15.2	16.6	31.8	6.1	19	14.2	19.1	33.3	3.0	9
Lincoln.....	12.0		12.0	10.3		10.3	10.3		10.3	4.7	7.0	11.7	5.3	45	10.3	9.4	19.7	5.5	28
Santa Fe.....	44.4		44.4	44.9		44.9	46.6		46.6	22.1	21.7	43.8	13.5	31	27.3	24.4	51.7	22.1	43
Total.....	370.6		370.6	383.9		383.9	385.6		385.6	219.1	249.8	468.9	307.2	66	138.5	135.4	273.9	145.0	53
Region 4:																			
Boise.....	130.0		130.0	130.0		130.0	135.0		135.0	68.0	67.0	135.0	141.9	105	64.0	68.5	132.5	87.7	66
Caribou.....	8.0		8.0	7.8		7.8	7.8		7.8	.3	1.5	1.8	2.2	122	.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	162
Challis.....	10.0		10.0	25.8		25.8	10.0		10.0	1.7	1.7	3.4	2.6	76	1.4	4.4	5.8	2.8	48
Payette.....	91.0		91.0	91.0		91.0	95.0		95.0	40.0	40.3	80.3	65.6	82	80.4	54.5	134.9	63.7	47
Salmon.....	20.0		20.0	24.5		24.5	24.5		24.5	9.4	12.0	21.4	18.9	88	10.4	16.5	26.9	14.1	52
Sawtooth.....	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	5.7	8.6	14.3	12.6	88	27.0	8.8	35.8	22.4	63
Targhee.....	40.0		40.0	69.0		69.0	50.0		50.0	7.2	16.5	23.7	11.0	46	7.5	11.4	18.9	19.0	101
Humboldt.....													.1					.1	
Toiyabe.....	7.0		7.0	25.0		25.0	17.7		17.7	4.0	4.5	8.5	2.0	24	2.4	6.0	8.4	.9	11
Ashley.....	18.5		18.5	32.4		32.4	24.2		24.2	6.4	6.0	12.4	9.2	74	4.0	9.5	13.5	1.4	10
Cache.....	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	1.3	1.4	2.7	2.0	74	.6	2.2	2.8	.9	32
Dixie.....	30.1		30.1	30.1		30.1	32.1		32.1	13.5	13.3	26.8	25.0	93	13.0	19.5	32.5	47.9	147
Fishlake.....	3.0		3.0	12.7		12.7	12.7		12.7	1.1	1.6	2.7	1.4	52	4.1	4.5	8.6	.4	5

Manti-La Sal	7.5	7.5	11.2	11.2	31.3	31.3	7.4	5.5	12.9	14.3	111	1.6	3.0	4.6	2.1	46	
Uinta	3.0	3.0	13.8	13.8	13.5	13.5	2.3	4.0	6.3	3.7	59	3.2	7.6	10.8	4.2	39	
Wasatch	16.0	16.0	15.0	15.0	27.5	27.5	12.5	5.7	18.2	6.5	36	19.2	9.6	28.8	2.3	8	
Bridger	54.8	54.8	54.8	54.8	51.5	51.5	10.6	9.5	20.1	11.7	68	4.1	20.0	24.1	3.7	15	
Teton	16.0	16.0	25.1	25.1	29.5	29.5	4.6	5.8	10.4	13.0	125	17.5	15.4	32.9	3.2		
Total	483.9	483.9	594.2	594.2	588.3	588.3	196.0	204.9	400.9	343.7	86	260.5	262.6	523.1	272.5	52	
Region 5:																	
Angeles					3.4	3.4	3.7	.7	4.4	.7	16	1.6	.5	2.1	1.2	57	
Cleveland					2	2	1	.1	2	.1	50	1	1	2	1	50	
Eldorado	96.0	96.0	116.0	116.0	130.0	130.0	50.7	52.2	102.9	74.5	72	63.4	67.0	130.4	112.7	86	
Inyo	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	8.5	7.0	15.5	11.7	75	4.2	6.0	10.2	5.5	54	
Klamath	183.0	183.0	185.0	185.0	238.0	238.0	100.2	100.5	200.7	161.7	81	103.2	116.0	219.2	153.9	70	
Lassen	95.0	95.0	99.0	99.0	170.0	170.0	51.9	55.9	107.8	109.3	101	55.1	59.0	114.1	67.4	59	
Los Padres					3.6	3.6	1	2.3	2.4	4.6	192	3.2		3.2	6.3	197	
Mendocino	76.0	76.0	81.0	81.0	89.0	89.0	49.7	46.0	95.7	73.0	76	45.3	57.5	102.8	79.5	77	
Modoc	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	62.0	62.0	29.1	28.6	57.7	48.4	84	31.6	35.5	67.1	74.2	111	
Plumas	169.0	169.0	183.0	183.0	218.0	218.0	100.1	93.5	193.6	151.8	78	100.6	101.0	201.6	209.0	104	
San Bernardino					11.0	11.0	5.0	10.2	15.2	10.1	66	5.9	9.0	14.9	5.3	36	
Sequoia	86.0	86.0	101.0	101.0	110.0	110.0	32.8	30.7	63.5	39.5	62	51.8	39.0	90.8	10.0	11	
Shasta-Trinity	218.0	218.0	218.0	218.0	284.0	284.0	107.7	114.0	221.7	210.1	95	124.2	125.5	249.7	286.0	115	
Sierra	91.0	91.0	114.0	114.0	152.0	152.0	48.3	66.9	115.2	154.9	134	63.4	75.0	138.4	117.9	85	
Six Rivers	162.0	162.0	156.0	156.0	198.0	198.0	65.0	76.7	141.7	133.1	94	87.4	92.5	179.9	201.4	112	
Stanislaus	102.0	102.0	123.0	123.0	139.0	139.0	61.3	66.9	128.2	59.4	46	63.4	72.0	135.4	135.9	100	
Tahoe	109.0	109.0	130.0	130.0	149.0	149.0	119.5	67.2	186.7	123.5	66	58.1	50.5	108.6	77.4	71	
Total	1,457.2	1,457.2	1,576.4	1,576.4	1,976.4	1,976.4	833.7	819.4	1,653.1	1,366.4	83	862.5	906.1	1,768.6	1,543.7	87	
Region 6:																	
Deschutes	136.0	136.0	136.0	136.0	138.0	138.0	75.0	61.7	136.7	136.2	100	72.1	86.4	158.5	102.7	65	
Fremont	126.0	126.0	126.0	126.0	129.0	129.0	70.5	58.2	128.7	91.4	71	40.1	63.6	103.7	160.2	154	
Malheur	138.0	138.0	171.0	171.0	171.0	171.0	81.4	80.9	162.3	142.6	88	54.6	85.7	140.3	193.9	138	
Mount Hood	315.0	315.0	315.0	315.0	330.0	330.0	185.9	165.8	351.7	309.9	105	134.5	170.6	305.1	334.2	110	
Ochoco	96.0	96.0	98.0	98.0	98.0	98.0	70.8	50.8	121.6	140.2	115	22.9	50.2	73.1	35.4	48	
Rogue River	135.0	135.0	126.0	126.0	179.0	179.0	90.3	74.4	164.7	209.1	127	89.5	84.5	174.0	181.3	104	
Siskiyou	185.0	185.0	179.0	179.0	191.0	191.0	90.2	93.2	183.4	177.2	97	100.4	88.4	188.8	152.3	81	
Suslaw	315.0	315.0	327.0	327.0	334.0	334.0	187.6	171.8	359.4	345.9	96	155.4	163.0	318.4	330.4	104	
Umatilla	110.0	110.0	129.0	129.0	135.0	135.0	66.4	68.0	124.4	109.4	88	61.8	55.7	117.5	93.2	79	
Umpqua	303.0	303.0	340.0	340.0	357.0	357.0	172.0	180.6	352.6	386.1	109	161.0	178.5	339.5	424.2	125	
Wallowa-Whitman	121.0	121.0	160.0	160.0	168.0	168.0	71.4	63.6	135.0	117.5	87	71.9	101.7	173.6	162.6	94	
Willamette	529.0	529.0	566.0	566.0	615.0	615.0	288.4	310.8	599.2	512.5	136	296.9	296.9	593.3	637.9	108	
Winema	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0	91.0	91.0	58.9	41.5	100.4	74.8	74	70.2	49.6	119.8	161.7	135	
Gifford Pinchot	395.0	395.0	395.0	395.0	381.0	381.0	237.7	238.1	475.8	442.8	93	294.6	212.2	506.8	433.2	85	
Mount Baker	201.0	201.0	201.0	201.0	164.0	164.0	121.9	114.5	236.4	226.8	96	117.3	100.6	217.9	209.7	95	
Okanogan	70.0	70.0	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0	37.7	39.7	77.4	83.0	107	58.0	60.0	118.0	115.1	98	
Olympic	341.0	341.0	341.0	341.0	343.0	343.0	148.2	145.3	293.5	273.4	93	228.7	148.7	377.4	186.1	49	
Snoqualmie	207.0	207.0	207.0	207.0	229.0	229.0	117.0	104.3	221.3	222.6	101	167.1	184.9	352.0	183.9	52	
Wenatchee	107.0	107.0	106.0	106.0	125.0	125.0	69.4	64.6	134.0	123.2	92	63.2	53.9	117.1	107.6	92	
Total	3,920.0	3,920.0	4,103.0	4,103.0	4,265.0	4,265.0	2,230.7	2,127.8	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	2,260.2	2,234.6	4,494.8	4,205.6	94	
Region 7:																	
Cumberland	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	11.5	12.0	23.5	20.5	87	12.5	28.7	85
White Mountain	11.0	12.0	23.0	11.0	12.0	23.0	15.0	40.0	55.0	12.5	104	8.0	12.5	20.5	16.4	80	
Allegheny	9.3	64.0	73.3	25.0	73.8	98.8	25.0	73.8	98.8	13.5	104	17.5	19.0	36.5	27.0	74	
Green Mountain	7.0	8.0	15.0	7.0	8.0	15.0	18.0	22.5	40.5	5.1	98	6.0	6.5	12.5	10.6	85	
George Washington	25.7	64.6	90.3	20.0	52.0	72.0	20.0	52.0	72.0	15.5	88	13.5	14.5	28.0	23.4	84	
Jefferson	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	8.0	89	10.0	10.5	20.5	19.2	94	
Monongahela	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	17.0	88	20.5	21.5	42.0	38.7	92	
Total	122.5	234.5	357.0	132.5	231.7	64.2	147.5	274.2	21.7	83.1	79.5	162.6	151.5	93	88.0	159.0	85
Region 8:																	
Alabama	43.1	11.5	54.6	42.8	16.5	59.3	45.3	21.3	66.6	34.5	27.5	62.0	57.3	92	26.5	52.8	95
Ouachita	89.9	43.1	133.0	89.2	42.4	131.6	89.2	42.4	131.6	72.5	88	67.5	68.0	135.5	134.2	99	
Ozark-St. Francis	35.6	4.7	40.3	36.5	4.6	41.1	36.5	4.6	41.1	24.0	79	22.5	22.5	45.0	54.6	121	
Florida	14.3	47.1	61.4	14.3	46.6	60.9	14.3	46.6	60.9	41.5	95	39.5	42.0	81.5	87.4	107	
Georgia	38.0	5.9	43.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	26.5	87	28.0	29.0	57.0	47.8	84	
Kisatchie	40.8	25.1	65.9	44.9	27.5	72.4	44.9	27.5	72.4	43.5	93	41.0	42.0	83.0	56.1	68	
Mississippi	96.3	53.7	150.0	99.4	75.9	175.3	102.1	73.0	175.1	77.5	104	84.5	87.0	171.5	158.4	92	
North Carolina	42.5	19.2	61.7	43.3	18.4	61.7	38.9	10.2	49.1	27.5	86	32.0	33.0	65.0	60.8	94	
South Carolina	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	45.0	104	50.0	53.0	103.0	115.3	112	
Cherokee	23.5	1.5	25.0	22.1	1.7	23.8	20.9	5.2	26.1	19.5	88	19.5	23.0	42.5	35.6	84	
Texas	69.6	38.9	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	70.0	74	54.0	62.5	116.5	70.4	60	
Total	533.0	273.8	806.8	545.4	301.6	847.0	545.0	298.8	843.8	482.0	414.0	896.0	817.3	91	465.0	873.4	91

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

[Millions of board feet]

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Saw-timber	Convert-ible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convert-ible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convert-ible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplish-ment				Planned	Accomplish-ment	
Region 9:																			
Chequamegon.....	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	17.6	15.3	32.9	27.0	82	20.2	18.5	38.7	42.0	109
Nicolet.....	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	18.7	17.2	35.9	34.9	97	20.4	22.1	42.5	35.4	83
Chippewa.....	4.3	43.7	48.0	8.4	70.9	79.3	8.4	70.9	79.3	18.4	20.3	38.7	30.2	78	20.0	22.8	42.8	50.6	118
Superior.....	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	52.5	47.5	100.0	73.0	73	90.2	90.1	180.3	56.9	32
Missouri.....	47.0	5.8	52.8	50.0	9.4	59.4	50.0	9.4	59.4	17.4	16.5	33.9	23.7	70	20.5	22.1	42.6	27.0	63
Hiawatha.....	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	20.9	18.3	39.2	36.1	92	26.5	25.0	51.5	48.1	93
Lower Michigan.....	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	29.2	26.5	55.7	48.0	86	25.4	25.7	51.1	51.3	100
Ottawa.....	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	22.6	24.0	46.6	40.4	87	25.6	26.1	51.7	40.8	79
Shawnee.....	5.8	5.8	10.1	2.0	12.1	10.1	2.0	12.1	2.7	3.6	6.3	14.3	227	2.0	2.3	4.3	17.2	400
Wayne-Hoosier.....	10.4	.9	11.3	9.7	2.5	12.2	9.7	2.5	12.2	5.0	5.2	10.2	8.2	80	6.7	5.8	12.5	9.1	73
Total.....	118.5	448.5	567.0	129.2	482.9	612.1	129.2	482.9	612.1	205.0	194.4	399.4	335.8	84	257.5	260.5	518.0	378.4	73
Region 10:																			
Chugach.....	79.0	79.0	79.0	79.0	79.0	79.0	6.3	3.5	9.8	7.2	73	3.3	4.3	7.6	1.0	13
North Tongass.....	530.1	530.1	530.1	530.1	530.1	530.1	85.0	79.8	164.8	177.2	108	83.9	49.6	133.5	59.6	45
South Tongass.....	270.0	270.0	294.2	294.2	293.8	293.8	93.6	91.2	184.8	189.2	102	48.2	28.3	76.5	137.8	180
Total.....	879.1	879.1	903.3	903.3	902.9	902.9	184.9	174.5	359.4	373.4	104	135.4	82.2	217.6	198.4	91
Grand total.....	9,562.3	956.8	10,519.1	10,295.2	1,016.2	11,311.4	10,959.9	1,055.9	12,015.8	5,182.6	4,950.4	10,133.0	9,596.2	95	5,607.4	5,549.9	11,157.3	9,532.9	85

* All conifers except hemlock, white pine and red pine measured as cordwood. Aspen and balsam of gilead measured only as cordwood.

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Un-cut volume under contract, Dec 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
					January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 1:																
Clearwater.....				248.9	\$2.37		\$2.37				\$4.50		\$4.50			
Coeur d'Alene.....				191.7	4.52	\$5.30	4.85				4.99	\$7.32	5.98			
Kaniksu.....				313.6	5.37	4.33	4.72				8.42	6.61	7.28			
Neperece.....				282.5	2.42	4.51	2.73				6.28	6.10	6.25			
St. Joe.....	4.2		4.2	251.4	2.24	4.56	3.47				2.84	4.97	3.97			
Beaverhead.....				76.2		1.95	1.95					2.24	2.24			
Bitterroot.....				60.3		3.61	3.20					5.61	7.36	6.33		
Custer.....		7	7	8.4	5.00		5.00				5.01		5.01			
Deerlodge.....				89.7												
Flathead.....				214.1	3.13	6.07	4.46				12.36	13.78	13.01			
Gallatin.....		5.5	5.5	72.7	1.97	3.57	2.17				1.97	3.58	2.17			
Helena.....	4.4		4.4	87.7	2.04		2.04				2.04		2.04			
Kootenai.....	8.5	4.5	13.0	302.9	2.45	2.50	2.46				5.75	3.74	5.31			
Lewis and Clark.....				142.1	2.27	2.00	2.24				3.41	3.20	3.30			
Lolo.....		1.0	1.0	240.3	2.70	6.08	3.64				5.53	8.63	6.39			
Colville.....				167.5	4.42	3.62	4.04				8.44	5.85	7.23			
Total.....	17.1	11.7	28.8	2,750.0	3.06	4.65	3.63				6.15	7.31	6.56			
Region 2:																
Arapaho.....		20.0	20.0	44.0	2.00	2.00	2.00				4.80	2.00	3.78			
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre.....		.6	.6	63.3	2.64	5.49	3.63				8.58	6.49	7.85			
Gunnison.....		3.2	3.2	156.7	2.00	2.62	2.17				5.05	5.86	5.28			
Pike.....				15.8		6.75	6.75					6.75	6.75			
Rio Grande.....				86.3	8.20	2.70	2.78				8.30	2.71	2.80			

Roosevelt.....		76.8	76.8	43.3	4.38	4.38			4.43	4.43				
Routt.....				48.5	2.58	3.57			3.57	3.33				
San Isabel.....		.2	.2	10.6		4.13				3.45				
San Juan.....				338.1	2.73	2.00			4.35	6.14				
White River.....		11.6	11.6	70.3		2.13				2.17				
Nebraska.....				.3										
Black Hills.....	6.0	48.3	54.3	132.2	5.11	5.42			5.26	5.94				
Bighorn.....		14.4	14.4	32.2		3.37				3.37				
Medicine Bow.....				192.4	2.00				2.00					
Shoshone.....				51.0	1.89	1.82			2.64	1.91				
Total.....	6.0	181.9	187.9	1,285.0	2.68	2.48			4.27	6.28				
Region 3:														
Apache.....				1,369.0	6.55	6.84			6.55	6.84				
Cocconino.....				666.0		5.17				5.20				
Coronado.....				1.4	9.85				9.85					
Kaibab.....				572.2	3.00	4.38			3.00	4.63				
Prescott.....		.8	.8	12.6		3.09				3.09				
Sitgreaves.....				645.0	8.30	4.29			8.36	8.31				
Tonto.....				305.0	3.00				3.00					
Carson.....				78.0	1.11	4.16			2.05	4.10				
Cibola.....				2.5	5.19	4.88			8.29	5.51				
Gila.....				21.6	4.86	2.53			4.86	2.53				
Lincoln.....				17.0	8.70	6.34			10.35	8.21				
Santa Fe.....		13.1	13.1	42.3	2.75	2.72			2.75	2.70				
Total.....		13.9	13.9	3,732.6	3.99	4.07			4.18	4.13				
Region 4:														
Boise.....		4.6	4.6	145.2	5.36	6.60			9.59	7.56				
Caribou.....				.4	4.20	3.90			4.48	3.90				
Challis.....				11.0	3.00	2.80			3.00	2.80				
Payette.....		13.2	13.2	185.5	4.98	2.64			5.05	4.04				
Salmon.....	3.6		3.6	25.8	3.51				3.59					
Sawtooth.....				45.2	3.85				7.88	3.97				
Targhee.....		2.8	2.8	372.7		2.32				2.32				
Humboldt.....														
Toiyabe.....				9.5		2.32				2.83				
Ashley.....				25.7	5.50	4.10			5.50	5.35				
Cache.....				1.3	3.00				3.00					
Dixie.....		1.8	1.8	34.3	5.83	4.27			5.91	4.27				
Fishlake.....				5.1		4.40				4.40				
Manti-La Sal.....	1.2	.4	1.6	8.9		3.51				4.62				
Uinta.....	.5		.5	2	2.79				2.98					
Wasatch.....		28.2	28.2	17.6		5.20				5.25				
Bridger.....		7.4	7.4	25.5	3.50				4.95	3.69				
Teton.....		.7	.7	9.5		1.90				1.90				
Total.....	5.3	59.1	64.4	923.4	5.32	3.80			7.27	4.30				
Region 5:														
Eldorado.....		5.9	5.9	97.0	6.79	10.00			14.56	17.70				
Inyo.....				4.0		1.40				1.40				
Klamath.....				206.7	4.51	5.34			7.50	5.64				
Lassen.....				127.1	9.65	5.00			16.11	16.10				
Los Padres.....				1.8	2.65				2.65					
Mendocino.....				78.0	5.19	3.44			5.50	4.43				
Modoc.....				88.0	2.91	9.14			10.31	11.17				
Plumas.....	.3		.3	247.2	10.36	11.33			14.66	13.65				
San Bernardino.....				6.5		3.70			3.70					
Sequoia.....		16.9	16.9	172.3	8.45	6.03			8.45	6.03				
Shasta-Trinity.....		.6	.6	322.7	9.33	14.33			14.90	15.55				
Sierra.....	9.8	8.4	18.2	119.5	5.06	8.74			6.42	12.49				
Six Rivers.....		4.7	4.7	255.0	8.90	12.29			13.31	15.62				
Stanislaus.....				130.3	7.70	5.39			8.16	8.98				
Tahoe.....				70.0	7.22	6.57			12.89	14.35				
Total.....	16.0	30.6	46.6	1,926.1	7.87	8.83			12.13	11.65				
Region 6:														
Deschutes.....				259.1	15.21	9.63			18.80	14.53				
Fremont.....	8.3	12.5	20.8	209.1	14.52	12.78			14.58	13.53				
Malheur.....				353.4	7.80	9.62			8.14	9.67				
Mount Hood.....				560.0	11.15	18.15			18.96	29.44				
Ochoco.....		.3	.3	143.0	6.99	7.30			8.76	9.70				
Rogue River.....				158.8	11.53	13.00			14.44	20.18				
Siskiyou.....				277.6	12.65	15.10			16.75	21.20				
Siuslaw.....		.2	.2	433.6	20.33	23.07			25.33	26.56				
Umatilla.....				280.2	8.31	6.28			11.75	8.81				
Umpqua.....				807.8	13.45	16.56			16.49	20.14				
Wallowa-Whitman.....	1.0	12.8	13.8	244.8	6.23	10.35			6.77	10.36				
Willamette.....				987.2	14.40	18.26			21.16	28.56				

¹ Spruce salvage.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
					January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 6—Continued																
Winema				403.7	\$15.72	\$10.42	\$14.08				\$23.65	\$11.36	\$19.84			
Gifford Pinchot	0.2	3.3	3.5	925.5	10.21	15.62	11.20				18.93	22.07	19.50			
Mount Baker				438.0	6.17	3.66	5.07				15.51	5.66	11.19			
Okanogan		3.2	3.2	98.0	4.62	7.42	6.48				6.52	7.92	7.44			
Olympic				881.2	6.32	6.82	6.62				9.00	8.16	8.49			
Snoqualmie	.3	19.3	19.6	433.7	12.46	13.89	13.39				18.67	18.48	18.55			
Wenatchee	1.3		1.3	174.5	7.56	14.25	8.56				8.57	17.01	9.83			
Total east side					10.39	9.41	10.07				12.48	10.75	11.90			
Total west side					12.80	14.85	13.55				19.11	20.67	19.68			
Total	11.1	51.6	62.7	8,069.2	12.14	13.53	12.64				17.30	18.26	17.64			
Region 7:																
Cumberland	1.3	1.0	2.3	16.3	14.29	14.89	14.51		\$3.00	\$3.00	15.63	16.24	15.85		\$3.39	\$3.39
White Mountain		.1	.1	30.9	16.07	15.42	15.65	\$8.64	1.26	4.74	20.11	16.36	17.65	\$10.96	1.29	5.85
Allegheny	5.5		5.5	32.9	42.56	40.05	41.73	1.08	1.67	1.29	52.01	53.73	52.59	1.08	1.67	1.29
Green Mountain	.1		.1	9.9	25.19		25.19	3.00		3.00	32.77		32.77	3.04		3.04
George Washington	.4	3.2	3.6	55.4	20.11	18.91	19.84		1.46	1.46	20.11	19.01	19.86		1.46	1.46
Jefferson	.2		.2	18.2	11.33	16.05	13.36		1.30	1.30	16.98	19.33	17.99		1.53	1.53
Monongahela	4.9	1.8	6.7	37.3	18.72	18.64	18.69	.82	1.05	.87	21.38	18.65	20.29	.95	1.25	1.01
Total	12.4	6.1	18.5	200.9	23.47	21.39	22.75	2.59	2.46	3.08	28.09	25.77	27.93	3.04	1.55	2.38
Region 8:																
Alabama	1.8	5.5	7.3	80.0	22.28	24.33	22.69	4.31	4.11	4.20	24.83	28.90	25.64	4.83	4.38	4.58
Ouachita		1.9	1.9	105.3	23.64	26.02	24.22	2.44	3.44	2.74	28.81	32.20	29.27	2.78	3.66	3.04
Ozark	.3		.3	42.5	15.89	16.95	16.09	5.76	5.25	5.62	19.09	20.34	19.33	6.44	5.32	6.13
Florida	4.5	.7	5.2	130.0	29.95	29.03	29.64	10.78	10.64	10.72	33.49	31.08	32.69	11.98	13.18	12.66
Georgia	.8	.5	1.3	33.7	21.05	24.89	22.32	12.16	11.13	11.36	27.42	30.76	28.52	13.06	11.88	12.15
Kisatchie	4.6	3.7	8.3	73.5	20.78	20.51	20.67	7.22	7.24	7.22	22.27	22.34	22.30	7.76	7.68	7.70
Mississippi	10.1	15.5	25.6	126.7	20.34	21.28	20.83	7.06	7.39	7.15	22.37	23.11	22.53	7.48	7.41	7.46
North Carolina	.5	.5	1.0	70.8	17.72	16.78	17.54	4.46	8.74	4.85	19.96	17.01	19.37	5.23	9.61	5.62
South Carolina		.5	.5	128.4	28.51	27.07	28.07	10.67	10.21	10.51	33.60	32.95	33.40	13.13	13.20	13.15
Cherokee	3.7	2.5	6.2	52.8	14.14	17.97	15.60	5.17	3.32	4.63	15.73	18.11	16.64	5.21	3.25	4.67
Texas	16.7	4.6	21.3	56.0	21.57	19.07	20.94	8.10	6.70	7.12	22.07	19.21	21.35	8.10	6.72	7.14
Total	42.7	36.2	78.9	899.7	21.56	22.72	21.86	7.85	8.54	8.11	24.69	26.13	25.07	8.89	9.92	9.28
Region 9:																
Chequamegon	2.0	1.3	3.3	91.1	23.83	13.25	16.68	4.46	3.00	3.68	31.40	13.78	19.48	6.22	3.42	4.74
Nicolet	5.4	2.0	7.4	81.8	25.71	25.33	25.53	4.34	3.28	3.96	43.04	39.69	41.47	5.12	3.42	4.50
Chippewa	2.7	3.4	6.1	87.4	17.58	18.63	18.03	2.90	2.92	2.90	18.62	19.85	19.15	3.68	2.98	3.30
Superior	19.6	39.0	58.6	502.8	11.69	9.59	10.60	3.56	3.60	3.58	24.51	13.56	18.71	4.76	4.46	4.66
Missouri	3.3	.3	3.6	54.6												
Clark					6.95	7.22	7.03				8.54	7.72	8.30			
Mark Twain					9.23	7.39	8.62				12.04	10.98	11.69			
Hiawatha	9.2	.8	10.0	87.0	13.38	13.47	13.40	5.06	3.36	4.74	23.26	22.06	23.00	6.34	5.58	6.20
Lower Michigan	9.7	1.5	11.2	153.5	8.61	5.83	7.18	3.84	5.88	4.30	8.85	6.69	7.69	4.22	5.60	4.62
Ottawa	2.5		2.5	81.0	14.05	20.39	16.14	3.54	3.58	3.56	24.47	36.03	28.28	3.68	4.34	3.88
Shawnee				28.3	14.87	6.80	10.99				18.73	6.98	13.08			
Wayne-Hoosier	1.0	.7	1.7	17.9	9.53	9.75	9.64				10.06	10.19	10.13			
Total	55.4	49.0	104.4	1,185.4	11.85	12.26	12.00	3.98	3.48	3.82	16.82	16.81	16.81	4.94	3.98	4.58
Region 10: 1																
North Tongass	14.8	3.8	18.6	8,005.7	2.45	1.71	2.18				2.62	1.71	2.28			
South Tongass	1.3		1.3	7,413.0	2.83	2.02	2.13				2.83	2.02	2.13			
Total	16.1	3.8	19.9	15,418.7	2.57	1.98	2.14				2.69	1.98	2.18			
Grand total	182.1	443.9	626.0	36,391.0												

1 Large pulpwood sales (80 percent) included as sawtimber.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, President Kennedy in his budget message singled out a few agencies for special commendation for the manner in which they had increased the efficiency of their operations.

One of the agencies so recognized was the Farmers Home Administration. The President pointed out the remarkable increase in the past 2 years in the number of loans processed per employee.

But this is only a part of the story about that organization and its accomplishments. Let me take the Senate back a few years in history.

When the Republican administration assumed power in 1953, the Farmers Home Administration was a well-established agency doing a good job of helping family farmers adjust to changing conditions and helping veterans become reestablished in farming. It was a solid and extremely useful agency.

What happened under the Benson administration?

The Farmers Home Administration was gutted. The staff of the agency was sharply reduced and a blanket was spread over its operations. If any progress was made at all during those long 8 years it was because the staff that remained kept on serving the needs of farmers despite every effort on the part of the administration to discourage such service.

With the advent of the Kennedy administration in 1961 the Farmers Home Administration took a new lease on life.

During its hibernation many dreadful things happened to American agriculture.

The farm population declined at the rate of 1 million persons a year.

Hundreds of rural communities lost large parts of their populations.

Net farm income spiraled downward. Farm people and rural problems were swept into the ashcan of neglect.

Let me remind Senators of some of the steps the Farmers Home Administration has taken on its comeback trail.

In the first spring of the Kennedy-Freeman administration the Farmers Home Administration, through the intervention of the President, obtained \$85 million in funds that had been frozen by the previous administration.

These funds were used to help small farmers finance their 1961 farming operations and to help farmers obtain better housing.

Before the spring was over Secretary Freeman, in recognition of the special problems rural communities face in their

struggle to avoid extinction, had established a rural areas development program and placed the Farmers Home Administration in a leadership position.

During the summer of 1961 the Farmers Home Administration received its first appropriations under the Kennedy administration. The amounts were hard to come by, for the Eisenhower budget had reduced FHA expenditures to the minimum. But the results were satisfying; a 60-percent increase was obtained. The agency moved ahead.

Then came the agriculture and housing bills for 1961.

The Agricultural Act literally remade the Farmers Home Administration. The ceiling on loans for farm operating expenses was increased. With this liberalization many farmers who had been shut off from the capital they needed received new hope. Loans to buy and enlarge farms were extended to cover the full range of family farms.

Loans were authorized to provide rural community water systems. As a result, during the past year and one-half, thousands of rural families have acquired a decent supply of good water.

Generally speaking, the whole program was made more flexible.

The insured loan program was reorganized in a manner that made it really workable for the first time.

The rural housing program was extended to enable the agency to serve the housing needs of families living in small rural communities. A special program to provide housing for domestic farm laborers was authorized.

In the spring of 1962 the agency announced a new forestry loan program. Drawing upon the authorities it possessed, the Farmers Home Administration worked out a special program of low-interest, deferred payment loans that matched the needs of family farmers who want to build their farm forests into income producing enterprises.

Last fall brought a further modernization of agency activities.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make loans to farmers for recreational enterprises and to make loans to associations serving farmers and other rural people to shift cropland into recreation areas, grassland, forest land and other uses. Authority also was provided for the development of rural renewal projects.

Under the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make special loans to elderly people in rural areas so they may build or buy homes suited to their special needs. Loans for the development of rental housing for the elderly in rural areas also were authorized.

It is a gratifying experience for the people that form an agency of Government to see the need for their special services recognized and to receive additional authorities in a more or less continual stream.

And it is equally gratifying to find that some additional funds have been provided so that the responsibilities newly acquired can be met. But while the supply of loan funds has increased, there are

still many urgent demands that cannot be met.

Currently there is an urgent need for operating loan funds. In this area the agency has not grown as it should have grown. It needs at least \$50 million more for loans to help farmers buy equipment, livestock, feed, and fertilizer this spring.

The agency also is in real difficulty in the matter of funds for personnel.

In fiscal 1963 the Farmers Home Administration will loan approximately \$820 million. In fiscal 1960 the FHA loaned \$309 million. This is a 166-percent increase.

In fiscal 1963 the agency will have on June 30 about \$2 billion of loans outstanding. This is nearly double the amount outstanding on June 30, 1960. I hasten to add that losses on loans, however, are less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

Despite the tremendous increase in lending, the Farmers Home Administration has a staff today that is only slightly larger than the staff it had in 1960.

Let me summarize what has happened.

In the 1950's the agency was cut down, far more than any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

During the past 2 years the agency has really forged ahead.

But the whole burden of new business has fallen on the shoulders of the reduced staff of employees who already had all they could handle.

The present staff is carrying an extremely heavy workload and is doing so to a large extent by personal sacrifice. The extent of personal sacrifice is illustrated by the fact that in 1962 employees put in over 260 man-years of voluntary noncompensated overtime. Forty-five percent of the employees lost annual leave.

To fully appreciate the extent of the demand for the services of the Farmers Home Administration, it is necessary to look beyond the statistics of loans and collections. These are impressive. The volume of lending has more than doubled since 1960. In fact, at the rate the organization is progressing the volume of its loans in 1964 will be three times as large as the 1960 program. But these figures are only a crude measure of the service rendered by the agency.

The Farmers Home Administration provides much more than a credit service. Each of the loans made by the agency is accompanied by technical supervision in farm and financial management.

The county supervisors of the Farmers Home Administration spend hours with every applicant helping him develop a farm plan that will make the most of his resources. And they work with their borrowers until they reach a point where they can qualify for credit from other services.

This type of work is becoming more difficult each year. The cost-price squeeze has cut profit margins in farming to such a low level that it is no easy task to help a family farmer figure out how to keep his head above water.

More and more of the farmers who call at the county offices of the Farmers Home Administration have, in their efforts to keep going, acquired a long string of debts. The time spent in helping these farmers work out a debt management program, including a budget that when followed will gradually get them back on their feet, is monumental.

We cannot afford to see the caliber of the work performed by the staff of the Farmers Home Administration diminished in any respect. This agency is the bulwark between family farmers and the forces that continually threaten their existence. If it is not properly staffed and funded, thousands of family farmers will be forced into contract farming. This agency is most responsive to the needs of the times. It has proved a most responsible caretaker of public funds. The losses on loans in the many programs it currently is administering run to less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

The importance of the Farmers Home Administration to rural communities is growing daily. Through the years, the dollars loaned to farmers by the agency and the increased incomes and net worths of borrowers have done much to stimulate the economies of small towns. Now, with the additional authorities the agency has received in the past 2 years, it has even more to offer rural areas. The new programs that finance rural community water systems, homes for elderly rural people, income producing recreational enterprises, and rural renewal programs, give direct and much needed support to the small towns of our country.

I have recommended to the Committee on Appropriations that at least \$800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year, so that a start can be made in raising the size of the FHA staff to a level commensurate with the demands for their services.

SUPPORT FOR HUMPHREY YOUTH BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my deep concern over the February unemployment figures which were recently released by the Department of Labor. I shall comment further, at another time, on the relationship between the overall rise in the percentage of unemployed to total employment from 5.8 percent to 6.1 percent and the President's tax proposals.

Of course, it is my view that the President's tax program will do as much as any one thing that we can do to stimulate our economy and thereby improve the employment picture.

But today I wish to emphasize the dramatic increase that again occurred among young people. The unemployment rate among teenagers rose from 13.9 to 15.6 percent, an increase so large that it accounted for almost half of the total increase.

The relationship of this increase to the need for prompt action on my Youth Employment Act is obvious. I regret

that I must stand on the floor today and cite such evidence in behalf of this legislation. Nothing would be more gratifying to me than a steady declining rate of youth unemployment. But, as the February figures indicate, this is not likely to happen without some specific employment assistance directed toward this age group.

The hearings on the Youth Employment Act have concluded in both the House and the Senate. The testimony in these hearings highlighted the particular difficulties encountered in solving unemployment problems in the 16 to 21 age group.

During the Senate hearings the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared simultaneously in support of S. 1 before the Labor Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment chaired by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The burden of the testimony presented by this impressive array of Cabinet officials, and numerous other persons from public and private life, indicated overwhelming support for the principal concepts embodied in the Humphrey youth bill. Several important aspects of the total youth employment program envisioned in this legislation should be emphasized.

First, as the principal author of this legislation, I do not advocate its passage with the unrealistic notion that the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps, in themselves, offer an ultimate solution to the problem of youth unemployment. What I do see this legislation providing is a sensible, reasonable, and tested method whereby a major start will be made toward meeting this critical problem.

Regarding title I of this legislation that establishes the Youth Conservation Corps, the results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's provide compelling evidence of what such a program can accomplish. It provides precisely what most unemployed young people lack: self-confidence, maturity, responsibility, and the mental health that only comes from hard physical labor. I maintain that until many of our young people acquire these personal qualities they will be unable to function as self-supporting and productive members of society. This fact is no less true in the 1960's than it was in the 1930's.

The Youth Conservation Corps will provide the opportunity to develop these personal qualities, but it will also do much more. There will be both on-the-job training and vocational training supplemented by certain basic academic instruction.

I mentioned this point because some critics of the Youth Conservation Corps have said that we ought to have more education in this program. Regrettably, sometimes these same critics vote against Federal aid to education. These critics say there ought to be more vocational training in the bill, so that the young people who come into the program will be equipped by training and

experience to move into regular jobs once they have left the Youth Conservation Corps.

I agree. However, this program, which is supported by the President, and was outlined in his youth message, and which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate, provides vocational and technical training, which will make it possible for young people to get this very valuable training so they can move into the regular employment force once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. I repeat that there will be both on-the-job training and vocational training, supplemented by certain academic instruction. It will be worked out in conjunction with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the State boards of education or commissioners of education, and in cooperation and in coordination with local school authorities.

The Youth Conservation Corps offers not only the opportunity for gainful employment; it also offers the greatest opportunity that we can give to young men between the ages of 16 and 21 for advanced training in vocational and technical areas of our present educational needs.

No one denies the crucial importance of these additional training and educational opportunities. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare offer firm assurances that such training will be provided.

One other complaint that has been made against the Youth Conservation Corps by some of its critics is that it is too small; that it ought to be bigger; that if unemployment is as large as some of us say it is—and what we say, of course, is based on statistical facts—the program ought to be much bigger.

I am delighted to hear that statement made. I think the program ought to be much larger. The same critics who say that, however, also want to cut the budget.

Mr. President, it is not possible to cut the budget and cut out new programs and cut down old programs, and still have a Youth Conservation Corps larger than is proposed here. The truth is that as this bill was developed, we worked very closely with the people in the White House, the special assistants to the President, and with the Department of Labor and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the Bureau of the Budget. We tried to come up with a program which was reasonable and was not too costly, and represented a beginning of a program which would encourage State and local governments to take on additional responsibilities.

We get the criticism, much of it in the hearings, at least from limited sources, to the effect that the program is not big enough, and that it does not offer enough education. The same critics are asking that the budget be cut and are not supporting the programs for aid to education.

There are numerous ways this training could be organized. For example, those enrollees who demonstrate an aptitude and interest in electronic repair work could be sent to a camp where this

specialty is provided. Those interested in auto mechanics could be directed to a camp specializing in this vocation skill. Or they could be directed to camps where the facilities in the local schools nearby will meet these requirements. Enrollees desiring to become proficient in handling of heavy machinery could go to a camp where work projects called for such machinery. This is one approach whereby meaningful vocation training could be provided.

Coupled with this training received in camps, the local employment service personnel who recruited the enrollee will have the responsibility of either locating a job or providing the opportunity for additional vocational training. When the YCC enrollee completes his period of enrollment, he will return with a record of personal accomplishment that will go a long way toward opening doors that were previously closed. He will have demonstrated his ability and willingness to work long, hard hours; he will have made a real beginning toward acquiring job skills. And in many cases, he will have experienced for the first time the thrill of self-fulfillment and self-satisfaction that only comes from a job well done.

I was much gratified by President Kennedy's endorsement of S. 1 made at his Wednesday press conference. I would like to quote from his opening statement:

First, hearings are being completed in both Houses on the youth employment opportunities bill and I hope this measure can be enacted before the Easter recess. One million of our youth are out of school and out of work, creating an explosive social situation in nearly every community. This bill would put their hands to work, and minds, in our parks and forests, manning our hospitals and juvenile centers, and developing skills and work experience which will help them in later life.

President Kennedy's plea for action before the Easter recess represents the feelings of many Members of Congress, assuming we have an Easter recess—which is a rather doubtful assumption.

I suggest to the three Members of the Senate who are on the floor that they might wish to call this little passage to the attention of their beloved colleagues.

I certainly intend to do everything in my power to bring this legislation to a successful conclusion as promptly as possible.

I was also most pleased to learn of the statement of support for the Youth Employment Act adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council during their recent meetings at Bal Harbour, Fla. This statement is direct, hard hitting, and argues the case for prompt passage of S. 1 in a highly persuasive fashion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963

This country cannot afford any further postponement in dealing with the employ-

ment needs of its young people. Delay now, in the face of the rapidly increasing numbers of youths pouring into the labor market, is unthinkable. For this reason, the AFL-CIO urges prompt action on the youth employment bill.

In 1962, nearly 1 million youths, 16 to 21 years old, who were in the market for jobs, were unable to find them. They represented nearly 25 percent of the total unemployed.

In addition to these 1 million unemployed young people, several hundred thousand more youths were compelled to work part time, because full-time employment was not available. Moreover, thousands more, indeed, tens of thousands, were not only out of school and out of work, they were also out of the labor force, not even bothering to look for work, because they had lost hope of finding jobs.

This is truly a situation loaded with social dynamite, and one which time alone will not remedy. The number of new young workers entering the labor force is increasing steadily; by 1970, young people will be entering the labor force at the rate of 3 million each year. This contrasts sharply with the decade of the 1950's, when the annual average of new young entrants into the labor force was less than 2 million.

A substantial increase in jobs is needed generally—for all those who are willing, able, and seeking work. But even in an improved economic climate, many young people will find it impossible to obtain jobs, because they will not possess the skills or education that modern technology requires. Thirty percent of the new entrants into the labor force in this decade will not have completed high school, and another 45 percent will end their education with only a high-school diploma. As a consequence, three-fourths of these new jobseekers, who will number 3 million a year by 1970, will be looking for work with inadequate preparation, in a period of rapid technological change, when employers are demanding a more skilled and a more educated work force. The amount of unemployment among youths that can result in the next 10 years is a bone-chilling prospect.

The most expensive course that can be taken now is inaction—to be impasse about a very real problem that is with us already and is growing each year.

The youth employment bill will channel the energies of some of these young people—albeit a modest number—into productive employment. It will provide jobs for youths—15,000 during the first year and up to 60,000 thereafter—in outdoor conservation work. In addition, the bill would also enable some young people—up to 50,000 during the first year and whatever numbers Congress determines for subsequent years—to enroll for such community service work as libraries, playgrounds, and hospitals.

Measured against the size of the problem, the youth employment bill is a most modest effort. The number of openings authorized for young people should be greatly increased. But at least it is a start. It will enable young people to gain some practical job training and some employment experience, and thereby ease their transition from school to work. At the same time, the proposed bill will permit the participants to make a positive contribution to the Nation and its communities, by their work to conserve and develop our natural resources and to participate in community service programs.

The job problem of our youth population is critical, and left unattended it will get worse. The time to act is now, and the action needed is to adopt the youth employment bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received similar indications of support from all sections of the United States and from all segments of society.

Never before in the long history of this struggle has public attention been so directly focused on the critical need for constructive and sensible programs to begin an attack on the problem of youth unemployment.

I have received literally thousands of letters from associations, societies, commissions, committees, and individuals concerned with problems of our young people. The percentage endorsing the passage of S. 1 is certainly over 98 percent. A number of these letters were reproduced in the Senate hearings and I urge my colleagues to glance through them when printed copies are released in the near future.

There also have been many editorials in newspapers and magazines supporting passage of S. 1, the Humphrey youth bill. A number of excellent feature articles have appeared during the past weeks.

Mr. President, from this welter of letters, editorials, articles, and statements supporting the Youth Employment Act I have gleaned several that are of special significance. In particular, I have received a marvelous letter from my good friend Frederick Manfred, the eminent Minnesota author. He describes in glowing language the importance of providing ways by which our young men expend their normal enthusiasm and drive in constructive channels. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Frederick Manfred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 30, 1963.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I have now had a chance to study your bill, Youth Employment Act of 1963, which contains two principal proposals: the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and a program of youth local area employment.

Many colleges and universities have set up scholarship programs to help out the bright boy or girl coming from a poor or needy family. This is all to the good. It will help to keep our democracy fresh and vital.

But it is not enough. Many a young man still graduates from high school who hasn't quite made up his mind what to do with his life. He doesn't particularly care to go to college, though he might be bright enough, and he hasn't particularly made up his mind what kind of trade he should go into. He finds himself at loose ends, with no goal in mind, at the same time that he is loaded with energy. Such a boy, no matter how good he might be, very possibly can be headed for trouble. He is looking for something real to do, and it just isn't there to be done.

In the old days, before 1900, much of this kind of aimless energy of young men was taken care of by the needs of our expanding economy, particularly all along the western frontier. We always had a real safety valve in our Far West. But those days are gone. We now need to look for new frontiers for these kind of young fellows.

In my researches for my books about the old Far West, and about prewhite Indian times, I've often been struck by the interesting way that the old chiefs handled their young men with itchy natures. They let the young braves expend their extra energy in little sorties against the enemy in the form of horse-raiding parties or war skirmishes. None of these "attacks" were ever

intended to be serious. In fact, the old chiefs and shamans, when telling of their exploits to little boys, made it a point to stress that a successful raid was one where horses were taken without loss of life to either side. The greatest coup of all was the one in which a young brave entered an enemy camp stealthily at night, touched an enemy brave with his spear or bowtip, and then successfully got away without being caught. Touching the enemy without getting caught, a sort of white man's tag, was the great thing. Actual scalping and killing was far down the lists of accomplishments. This pretty well took care of the young antsy braves in those days.

I was 17 and full of exploding beans myself once. I had so much of it I could shock grain all day from 5 in the morning until 6 in the evening, and still have enough drive left to pitch a 9-inning game of baseball. And after the ballgame still have enough of a whistle left to want to paint the town red until 2 in the morning. So I can readily appreciate what some of these young fellows are up against these days.

It seems to me that the YCC answers many problems. It keeps the young man busy, it gives him some money and as such financial freedom, and it allows him to work at something that in his mind has some meaning, is worth doing, can be bragged about amongst the boys. He will be outdoors, he can flex, and yes, even tire, his muscles, he will be close to his original mother, nature, and he will have a chance to see himself as a worthwhile part of a great nation.

Meanwhile, we, the Nation, are the real gainers. We will not only be getting some necessary and worthwhile work done, we shall be growing men in our midst.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK MANFRED.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also have for insertion in the RECORD some of the editorials that have recently appeared in favor of the Youth Employment Act. Included are editorials from the Saturday Evening Post, Forbes Business and Finance, the Chicago Daily News, and the Washington Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various editorials supporting the Humphrey youth bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 9, 1963]

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE READING PROBLEM

Unemployment in the United States continues at a disturbingly high level, about 5.5 percent. In the age of automation it is most severe among the unskilled, causing a nationwide chorus of advice to young people to stay in school. Yet of the 26 million who will come into the labor market during the next decade, nearly one-third, if present trends continue, will not have a high-school diploma. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the 300,000 increase in unemployed late in 1962 was made up almost entirely of teenagers.

Among several reasons for school dropouts, one of the most important is that the student never really learned to read. In a New York State training school for young lawbreakers one-third of the boys from 12 to 15 could read only at the second-grade level. Dr. Emory Stoops, of the University of Southern California says, "Poor reading ability handicaps students in all subjects, poor readers tend to get poor marks, and students with poor marks get discouraged and drop out of school." Dr. James B. Conant recently reported: "In the slums one finds today an

incredibly large percentage of pupils who may properly be designated as slow and very slow readers." In a Negro slum in a large American city, Dr. Conant found 70 percent of the boys and girls over 16 out of school and unemployed. Joblessness for those under 21, he reported, is 2½ times as high as for the whole population. Today there are an estimated three dropouts for every two unskilled jobs—a really alarming figure. Among the poor readers a good proportion have intelligence well above the average.

The dropouts are very likely to become delinquents. Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, a psychiatrist doing research in this field, says, "Reading retardation makes it almost impossible for the delinquent to find a job and unemployment aggravates his delinquency."

In Chicago half the people on relief are "functional illiterates"—either they cannot read at all or can read so little as to be useless. Similar facts were unearthed in Detroit and Philadelphia. In some cities those on relief are compelled to study reading. In many communities it is being taught by television, early in the morning; some people who are too proud to join classes are willing to learn in this way.

In regions with very high chronic unemployment, where retraining programs have been instituted, about one-third of the potential trainees are barred because of illiteracy. In some universities 20 percent of the freshmen have to take remedial reading; obviously the percentage of those who need the remedy is higher among dropouts from elementary or secondary school.

A bitter battle is raging in the educational world over methods used in the United States to teach reading. Few laymen are competent to judge the merits of the battle, but they can see that it is time to abandon prejudices and solve the reading problem.

Arthur S. Trace, Jr., in "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," notes that no such difficulty exists in the Soviet Union. Educators who have studied the question report that most Russian children learn to read early and well. The countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia say there is rarely any problem, once a child—or an adult—has been given a chance to learn.

It is embarrassing that the greatest nation on earth should have such a high rate of unemployment that can in large measure be associated with a failure to teach many of our young people anything so fundamental as reading. The 87th Congress passed the Manpower Retraining Act to cope with the problem of training unskilled workers but failed to act on two other important measures: the adult basic education bill and the youth opportunities bill. The 88th Congress should pass both of them.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 15, 1963]

SENSIBLE PROPOSALS FOR YOUTH

There may be room for debate on the mechanics of President Kennedy's new youth program, but certainly it strikes at the heart of the problem with its central proposition: Give the idle hands something constructive to do.

Particularly promising is the proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps of 15,000, to work and be trained in national forests and recreational areas. As part of the same program the Federal Government would provide matching payments to communities that established similar local projects.

To the extent that these programs were wisely conceived and implemented, they could make a considerable contribution.

They would provide a practical means of attacking the high school dropout problem and the juvenile crime and delinquency associated with that problem. Virtually every community is struggling to get this generation's outside horde of dropouts off the streets and into some kind of constructive pursuits. As the President said, the commu-

nities have primary responsibility for their own, but the Federal Government has unique facilities to care for a portion of these hapless youngsters.

Of all the depression-born agencies created to take up the job slack, the Civilian Conservation Corps (on which the new Youth Conservation Corps will obviously be modeled) was the most successful. It provided work and pay over the years for some 2 million men, but more than that, it gave them a chance to learn useful skills in a healthful, body-building regimen.

In this time when lack of skills contributes so heavily to unemployment, the new program could provide invaluable training, as well as a livelihood, for thousands of potentially useful young people.

Among the President's other youth program proposals, we welcome the suggestion that the Juvenile Delinquency Act be extended for another 3 years. Delinquency is manifestly a nationwide problem, and the Federal Government has a proper role in coordinating research and disseminating knowledge.

As to the National Service Corps—the long-heralded domestic Peace Corps—we will need some convincing. The President says volunteers in this Corps would serve in hospitals, mental health centers, on Indian reservations, and in slums. There is urgent work to be done in all these areas, of course. We would like, first, to know just how the young corps men and women are to be trained and put to useful service.

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press, Feb. 16, 1963]

THE YOUTH PROPOSAL

President Kennedy's proposed youth legislation is different from previous attempts in this area in that it attacks the problem from a new angle. The President didn't say so directly, but his proposed program recognizes that mounting delinquency is the product of industrial progress and automation.

For the past two or three decades people who spent their youth in the days of the wood burning stove, the horse and buggy and the family cow, have looked longingly back on those years and said that was the kind of life the modern youngster needed. There was more truth to those statements than we frequently have been willing to admit.

No matter what else may be said, one of the prime causes of problems among youngsters is idleness. When we ceased living close to the land we had trouble finding enough for our boys and girls to do. Recently has been added the difficulty in getting a job if you do not have advanced education. This is what is known now as the dropout problem.

The President's program, which if we remember correctly was first proposed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota several years ago, recognizes first of all the necessity for keeping young people busy. He called for a youth conservation corps to work in national parks and forests. He also urged what he called a hometown youth corps.

The objective of both of these plans is to put youngsters to work. Those who are unable to find jobs because they have left school at too early an age will have something to do in the field of manual labor. The youngsters who have been idle for possibly other reasons and only have been getting themselves into trouble can be induced to join the youth corps.

The question certainly will be raised as to what might be the ultimate cost of this project. It is sure not to be small. But weighed against the outlay of dollars must be the saving of young people who otherwise stand to cost the Nation and the various States many millions of dollars by pursuing lives of crime. It doesn't seem rea-

sonable to dismiss this proposal merely on the grounds that it costs too much.

[From the Mesabi Daily News, Virginia, Minn., Jan. 8, 1963]

THE YCC BILL: A BOON TO NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

(By Ham and Herm)

Questionable as some relief acts may have been for producing material of lasting value, it goes without saying that the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of depression days in the 1930's did northern Minnesota a lot of lasting good. It came at a time when the State's conservationists, a mere handful of them at the time, saw no way of doing anything about the sad plight into which our State's land, timber, and waterways had deteriorated.

With the CCC program launched, Minnesota's Department of Conservation had long-range plans off drawing boards and ready for reconstruction of our woodlands and waterways, just waiting for an opportunity to be put into effect. Consequently, Minnesota got off to a real good start in its reforestation program, woods-road building, and improvement of its canoe routes and portage trails. Minnesota led all States in having a program of improvement ready.

History has recorded the untold wealth this program brought to our section of the State. Work done on our forests in those days has paid off thousandsfold already, and real earnings are still being harvested. In plain dollars and cents, timber operators, resort owners, wilderness canoe outfitters, sporting goods outlets, guides, boatmakers, pulpcutters, and dozens of related enterprises have received bounteously and directly from the comparatively small investments made in the CCC program.

With the advent of war, the program ceased. Occasionally trial balloons for resuming the program have been sent up without any great result. Bills have been introduced in the Nation's Capitol at varied times to reactivate the program, which have either died in committee or were voted down.

Now Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has again introduced legislation to reactivate the program, under the banner of a Youth Conservation Corps, which would provide youth of the country an opportunity to work for board, room, clothing, and modicum pay at camps in areas of the country where there are national parks and great demands for improvements on waterways and soil erosion districts. With serious unemployment having hit certain sections of the country, northeastern Minnesota being one of them, it is believed the bill now may have a better chance of going through Congress and receiving approval of the President.

For many years, off and on through this column, we have suggested that such a program, especially for northeastern Minnesota, would be a fine thing. We have observed through the years what wonders many of our young men developed in their characters as a direct result of having served in the CCC for a year or two.

On occasion while on canoe trips along the Border Chain we have met canoeists from big cities outside this State, who were making visits again in the country where they had worked in CCC camps, and where they had learned their first valuable lessons in woods and lake lore. The tremendous upswing in family camping trips developing in the country today largely can be laid to a generation of boys having learned something of the outdoors and its wonders through the old CCC program. These boys now are family men. They are now exposing their wives and children to the same outdoors they had received so much from as young men.

Of all the relief programs there were in effect in the United States in the days of the old depression, none still holds its values as

greatly as does the old CCC program. Men now, who took advantage of the CCC as boys, are proud of having been in it. The value of their work can be appreciated in bas relief today.

Where in the 1930's only windfall-strewn areas, held up by blackened stumps of past devastating forest fires, covered thousands of acres of our wild land and surrounding sections of lakeshores there now grow beautiful stands of timber. Where our streams flowed only in trickles in the 1930's, navigable waters now tumble, twist and wind through fascinating ever-increasing woodland acreages.

The thousands of canoeists who every summer take to the canoe-pack trails along our great chain of historical waterways, are perpetual reminders of what the CCC program of old has done for our people, not only in providing places for great recreation and spiritual replenishing, but also providing the climate for a thriving vacationland commerce.

If the present YCC bill up before the Nation's lawmakers is passed this year, it will be a great boon to our vacationland, farming and timber industries. And perhaps more valuable, but not to be measured in dollars and cents, it will provide another generation of young men and boys another great opportunity of finding the lasting spiritual and character-building values which the great out-of-doors reveals to those who will visit her and live with her for a time.

Let's send some messages to our lawmakers. They already are sold on the proposal, but no doubt they would welcome encouragement. Northeastern Minnesota of all places in the country would profit most from the program. The time, for here, is ripe.

[From Forbes Business & Finance, Feb. 15, 1963]

POIGNANT UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

The disastrous impact of lengthy unemployment of family breadwinners needs no documentation. As in the case of the other fellow's toothache, it is easy to extend one's sympathy without feeling the pain.

Rightly, most attention and most attempts to tackle unemployment emphasize the dire situation confronting a workless man with a family to support. His problems are immediate and imperative.

Less pressing, but perhaps wreaking greater individual havoc, is unemployment of the quite young—the teenagers out of school or no longer able to afford school. For youth, with a vitality unvitiated by age, drift often means disaster. The young have to be doing, and if it cannot be the doing of work, it is sometimes the doing of bad. A man of more years, and particularly a man with a family, has the maturity of experience. He doesn't seek to solve his galling idleness with what the psychologists call antisocial activities. It is established that among the 4.7 million of unemployed, 709,000 are under 20 years of age. Before these young people have the habit of work, they have had to learn to cope with idleness, to develop a busy life doing nothing. Sourness and cynicism are the inevitable accompaniments.

Fortunately for many in this category, it is an ideal time to put in the required military service in the course of which, often, useful skills are learned.

But for a large number of these young unemployed there must be some other avenue. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has placed a Youth Conservation Corps bill before the Senate. It seeks to provide outdoor training and employment for young men in the conservation of natural resources, similar in principle to the former Civilian Conservation Corps. Enlistment in this program would be for 6 months to 2

years. Another feature of the bill is a youth public service employment program wherein the Federal Government could match State funds for the local employment of youngsters.

The bill is a sound, good concept.

[From Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News Dec. 27, 1962]

BETTER FOR YOUTHS TO KEEP BUSY

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator HUMPHREY's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1962]

IDLE YOUTH

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator HUMPHREY's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1963]

IDLE YOUTH

"Idle youths on our city streets create a host of problems," said the President the other day. It is not alone that they are adrift and unable to find their way and thus be a problem to themselves; from the point of view of the Nation, the economy is deprived of their potential contribution, and because they cannot find lawful employment, they are all too likely to occupy their time unlawfully.

"Unemployment among young workers today is 2½ times the national average, and even higher among minority groups and those unable to complete their high school education," the President reported to the Congress. "During the 1960's 7½ million students will drop out of school without a high school education, at present rates, thereby entering the labor market unprepared for anything except the diminishing number of unskilled labor openings."

This is, in itself, a national scandal, of course, and needs to be countered by a dramatic strengthening of the public school system. In the meantime, however, there is an immediate and urgent need for Federal

action to rescue these unhappy castaways. President Kennedy has, therefore, asked Congress to enact a double-barreled program.

One part of it is patterned on the Civilian Conservation Corps which proved such a boon to idle youth during the depression years of the New Deal. It would consist of a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps—both proposed in the last Congress by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY—to give young people healthful employment at tasks of genuine usefulness to the Nation.

The other part is a National Service Corps, patterned on the Peace Corps, save that it would enlist the latent enthusiasm of young persons for domestic instead of foreign service. Like the Peace Corps abroad, it can do immensely important work in underdeveloped urban neighborhoods—and do it to the immense benefit of the Corps members as well as the people they help.

The need for these projects is now, and it is an extremely pressing need. Congress ought to give these Presidential recommendations priority and a swift, hearty endorsement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my prepared testimony before the Clark subcommittee and a transcript of remarks by Secretary of Labor Wirtz and myself as delivered on a recent television report to Minnesota be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

(Statement of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, before Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, February 25, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am honored and privileged to open the Senate hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am particularly pleased to testify before the subcommittee chaired by my good friend from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK. His concern for problems of young people has been a distinguishing feature of his outstanding service in this body.

My testimony before the appropriate subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has become something of a bi-annual ritual. This is the third time I have appeared to urge the passage of legislation to establish the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps. While the earlier two sets of hearings did not lead to legislation, they were most valuable in gathering evidence, facts, opinions, and statements relating to the desirability of programs designed to fight the growing problem of youth unemployment.

But unless I read the signs and sentiments of the country incorrectly, I believe that the time has arrived for the prompt enactment of the Youth Employment Act. As you know, it was the first bill introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I have pledged myself to making it the first major item of legislation in the 88th Congress. I deeply hope that this objective will be achieved before the Congress adjourns for the Easter recess.

It might be helpful for the committee if I briefly reviewed the past history of this legislation. I first proposed the establishment of a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the 85th Congress. However, no action was taken on this pilot proposal and the bill died. In the 86th Congress, despite the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, the Youth Conservation Corps bill was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, largely through the fine efforts and leadership of the senior

Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH. The Senate passed this bill, S. 812, by a narrow margin of 47 to 45 in August 1959. The House of Representatives failed to act and once again the legislation died at the end of the 86th Congress. In the 87th Congress, my original bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps, S. 404, was supplemented with President Kennedy's proposals to establish a broader youth employment opportunities program. This committee amended S. 404 to include a Hometown Youth Corps and favorably reported the bill in September 1961. The legislation remained on the Senate calendar throughout the 2d session of the 87th Congress waiting for favorable action in the House. Once again, this action was not forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the 88th Congress and the introduction of S. 1. As you know, hearings have been underway in the House of Representatives for 1 week. The Senate hearings begin today. The President has endorsed this legislation and sent a special message on youth urging prompt enactment of S. 1. This morning I am here with the same message.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, I believe the members of the subcommittee are quite familiar with the provisions of the Humphrey youth bill. Title I provides for a Youth Conservation Corps "to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas." The Youth Conservation Corps will be established in the Department of Labor under the immediate supervision of a Director who will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Enrollment in the Youth Conservation Corps will be open to young men 15 through 21. Minimum enrollment period will be 6 months with a maximum enrollment of 2 years. Enrollees will receive \$60 per month in wages and also receive board, lodging, clothing, tools, and equipment, medical care, and other necessities. The present legislation calls for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees during the first fiscal year of operation and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I will comment further on the size of the YCC later in my testimony.

Two-thirds of the YCC will work on lands of the national forests, national parks, and other Federal conservation agencies. One-third of the Corps will be available for similar work on State forests and parks on a 50-50 matching funds basis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a summary of the provisions of S. 1 be printed in the hearing record at this point in my testimony.

OPPORTUNITY FOR A NEW LIFE

I am not here to provide the subcommittee with masses of statistical and technical data demonstrating the need for enactment of the Youth Employment Act. I willingly defer in this task to the many experts from the executive agencies and private life who will appear in the coming days. But I am here to reaffirm the need for the programs contained in the Humphrey youth bill in view of the rising number of unemployed youth in this Nation and in view of the vast amounts of useful and productive work that exist for such young people to do.

There are obvious similarities between the Youth Conservation Corps and the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps that existed during the 1930's. Certain critics of the YCC have alleged that the problems of unemployed youths today are greatly different from the unemployment problems that existed during the great depression.

Therefore they oppose the YCC as being inadequate to the needs of today. I would like to take several minutes to spell out why I reject this argument.

Most of the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps will have dropped out of high school prior to graduation. They will have failed in the job of getting a basic education. Having dropped out of school, they will have attempted to secure some manner of employment to support themselves. Lacking adequate education and job skills, they have been unable to find steady employment. Once again, they will have failed. Now they are loafing around the streets, staying at home, getting in the way, and are reminded repeatedly of their failures in school and employment.

In short, their lives have been little more than a succession of failures. As one of its important functions, I see the Youth Conservation Corps providing these young men with an opportunity to break this pattern of defeat and frustration and substitute for it an experience of accomplishment and self-fulfillment. I recently encountered a study made of 272 boys who participated in the Civilian Conservation Corps. In some detail this study explored the operation of the corps and its effect on this selected group of enrollees. I would like to quote from the conclusions of this study: "The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experiences seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are impressed with the values from which many of them benefited, but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values."

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include in my testimony portions of case studies of individual boys that relate to this specific point. This study, "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys," is highly objective. It does not praise every phase of the corps operation; it contains a number of constructive suggestions. Those persons charged with organizing the YCC could learn a great deal from this study. But, in all objectivity, the burden of this study is highly favorable to the total results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I believe this opportunity to create self-confidence in discouraged young men, to bring forth maturity in the immature, and to provide accomplishment in place of failure, will have lasting impact on the lives of many enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps. Do young men ever outgrow the need for such feelings of self-confidence, maturity, and accomplishment? The answer to this question is self-evident.

If the Civilian Conservation Corps succeeded in providing such an opportunity to young men in the 1930's, I believe the Youth Conservation Corps can fulfill a similar need in the 1960's.

There are, of course, numerous other reasons to support the Humphrey youth bill. The enrollees will receive job experience and training that will vastly improve their chances of obtaining steady employment once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. Let me cite some of the specific jobs that would have to be done by YCC enrollees: building fences, carpentry work, planting trees, driving trucks and tractors, stringing telephone lines, painting camps, jack-hammer jobs, fighting forest fires, fighting blister rust, surveying, machine maintenance, pick and shovel work, laying brick and stone, mixing cement, camp maintenance work, etc. Some of the work will be

hard manual labor; other aspects of the work program will consist of more advanced and skilled training.

A minimum of 10 hours per week of more formalized training will supplement the on-the-job experience. This training will be provided through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and State and local school officials. It will consist of supplementary academic subjects, such as writing, reading, and basic mathematics skills, and vocational subjects relating to future job opportunities. Also included in the total program available to each YCC enrollee will be the active efforts of the local State employment service to have a suitable job situation ready when the tour of duty has been completed.

This last factor is most important to the success of the total program. I intend to insist that no effort be spared by the local employment officers in every State to provide every YCC enrollee with at least one opportunity to demonstrate to the community what he has achieved through his enrollment.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATION'S RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, up to this point in my testimony I have concentrated entirely on the benefits that will accrue to the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps. That is entirely proper since we are primarily concerned with bringing unemployed young men back into the mainstream of society. But we should not overlook the great contributions these young men will make to the preservation and conservation of our national forests and parks. These are the dividends that will accrue to this country for many generations to come.

I am confident that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior will provide full documentation of the extensive work that is ready and waiting in our national forests and parks. The figure runs to many billions of dollars and this is the type of work that will have direct financial return to the Government for many future generations.

In the 87th Congress this committee assembled figures relating to the comparable costs of conservation work performed by regular employees and YCC enrollees. On the basis of the data submitted by various departments, it would cost \$5,120 to support one regular worker per year; the comparable cost per YCC enrollee would be \$3,640. This suggests that the Federal and State Governments will be getting a good bargain for the funds they invest in this program.

If those persons who criticize the Youth Conservation Corps because of so-called excessive cost would only deduct the eventual financial benefits from the initial operating cost figure, they would be hard pressed to continue their opposition on the basis of finances. I have always said that the entire Youth Conservation Corps program could be justified merely on the financial benefits that would eventually accrue to the United States. This would certainly be an extremely shortsighted view of the problem, but it could be done.

I am confident that testimony presented by the executive departments will fully confirm this statement.

MODEST SIZE OF YCC

I must also emphasize the relatively modest size of the YCC provided for in S. 1. As the Senators know, I have advocated a much larger corps in earlier versions of this legislation. S. 404, for example, provided for a YCC that would eventually enroll 150,000 young men. However, the administration felt unable to support a YCC of that magnitude. A number of Members of Congress likewise had some hesitation about establishing a corps of that size. The present legislation provides for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees in the first fiscal year

and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I believe this represents a size that all interested parties can accept in good faith. Moreover, I am confident that Congress will be sufficiently impressed with the success of the YCC to increase its authorized strength considerably at the end of 5 years.

I wish to emphasize that President Kennedy supports the size of the YCC established in S. 1. The identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives. Never before in the history of this legislation has there existed such unanimous agreement over the particular details of the program. This, in itself, is impressive testimony to the fundamental soundness and reasonableness of the Humphrey youth bill.

LOCAL AREA EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

I do not wish to conclude my testimony before I comment on title II, the local area youth employment programs or the hometown youth corps. This program provides an extremely important complement to the Youth Conservation Corps; namely, an opportunity for both young men and women to receive the benefits of supervised and planned job opportunities in local public service agencies.

Enrollees will remain in their home communities and work on a full-time or part-time basis. Hopefully those persons working part time will also maintain a relationship with their local schools. Those working full time will be encouraged to return to school at the conclusion of an enrollment period. The program will be geared to providing sufficient job skills and training to enable the enrollees to maintain steady employment on their own or to reawaken in the enrollees a desire to resume their formal education.

This legislation provides that these local employment programs will be initiated by the State or local community. Specific programs will be proposed to the Secretary of Labor for his approval. Once approved, the Federal Government will provide half the funds necessary to operate the entire program. It is projected that enrollees will receive approximately \$40 per week for their services.

What type of jobs will be available to the enrollees? There are a wide variety of jobs existing in the local public service agencies participating in the program. Let me suggest some that come to mind: secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, etc. As in the Youth Conservation Corps, the actual job experience would be supplemented by personal counseling after hours, educational opportunities, and assistance in obtaining regular employment at the conclusion of the program.

S. 1 authorizes a Hometown Youth Corps of 50,000 enrollees on a 50-50 matching basis for a period of 3 years. I have as much faith in the success of the Hometown Youth Corps as I do in the Youth Conservation Corps. I predict that Congress will establish the program on a permanent basis once the initial 3-year authorization has expired.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to keep my testimony brief. I know that members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee are intimately familiar with the fundamentals of this legislation. It has been through the mill several times before, as they say.

However, with the permission of the chairman, I would like to submit for inclusion in the record of these hearings a number of documents that relate to the Humphrey youth bill. For example, I have located a short pamphlet that outlines the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps in my home State of Minnesota. This pamphlet provides compelling evidence

for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. I have a number of personal letters that testify to the great merits of this legislation.

In closing, I have this final comment: These proposals have been before the Congress for 6 years. There is nothing novel, radical, unknown, or irresponsible about them. While Congress has been considering these proposals, the problem of youth unemployment has become extremely grave. Recent unemployment figures relating to young people show that the problem is about to get totally out of hand. Therefore I say to the Congress, let us procrastinate no longer. The time has come for decisions, not additional years of consideration.

The opportunity is ours. Let us seize it with firm determination.

REPORT ON YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate majority whip)

Introduction: This is Washington, and this is Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. Today the Senate majority whip has a special and distinguished guest to report on some important questions of vital interest to the people of Minnesota, as well as the Nation. Now, here is Senator HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Today I want to visit with you and to inquire of our guest about the Department of Labor, one of the important Cabinet level Departments in our Government. The Department of Labor has special responsibilities for the welfare of the American working man and woman, and it has special obligations relating to the enforcement of certain labor-management laws that have been enacted by Congress. This Department obviously has a great concern about problems such as unemployment and the lack of the proper and full use of our plant capacity.

Today I have as our guest a good friend, a gentleman I've known for many years, and one of our most distinguished national leaders and public servants. His name is Willard Wirtz and he is the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz is a fellow midwesterner. He comes from De Kalb, Ill., and he was educated in the Midwest at Beloit College, in Beloit, Wis. He received his law degree at Harvard University, which surely qualifies him for a prominent place in this administration, and later taught at the University of Iowa and at Northwestern University as a professor of law. Secretary Wirtz has had more than 20 years of good, substantial experience in labor-management relations. In January of 1961 he was appointed Under Secretary of the Department of Labor. With the appointment of Arthur Goldberg to the position of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Wirtz last year became the Secretary of Labor by appointment of President Kennedy.

We are honored to have you with us today, Mr. Secretary. But I'm going to toss you a few "hot ones," as they say, because you preside over one of the most interesting, and I think important departments of our Government—the kind of department that's in the midst of controversy, not of your own making, but because of the very nature of our economy.

First, Mr. Secretary, let's take a moment of your time to ask you: How do you describe your job?

Mr. Wirtz. Senator, it's interesting. The Department of Labor is going to be 50 years old next week. I was checking back the other day on the original statutes describing the responsibilities of the Department of Labor. They are clearly defined. Our obligation in the Department of Labor is to develop, preserve, and promote the interest of the wage earners, and particularly to do anything we can to increase job opportunities for wage earners. We figure most of us

in this country are wage earners, so I do not think that this is any narrow partisan interest at all. The answer to your question is really that our principal interest is in seeing to it that there is the fullest possible opportunity for a person of this Nation to enjoy the basic right to work, in the truest sense of the term. That would be the common denominator of most of our concerns.

Mr. HUMPHREY. You also have administrative responsibilities in the field of labor-management relations due to public law.

Mr. WIRTZ. Yes. There is the minimum wage law, the 1959 act establishing the responsibility of labor unions, the unemployment insurance program, the apprenticeship program, the Bureau of Labor Statistics research program, and an international program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Isn't it your department that always comes out at least once a month with the cost of living index?

Mr. WIRTZ. We come out with either good news or bad news twice a month. Once in connection with the cost of living index, which is administered and worked out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and then again on these monthly reports on employment and unemployment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now I want to get down to an issue that's before the Congress. The first bill that was introduced in this Congress, and one that has now received the active support of President Kennedy and the administration is the bill which I was privileged to sponsor, along with many other Senators, known as the Youth Employment Act of 1963. Your department will have real responsibilities under that act. How do you see the Youth Employment Act? Do you consider this important legislation? Does this have any real contribution it can make to our overall economic and social problems?

Mr. WIRTZ. From the standpoint of our interests, Senator, it is one of the two important programs this year. The other is the tax program. We think it is essential to get the economy moving to that point where there will be job opportunities for everybody. But beyond that, with respect to the unemployment problems specifically as it affects the younger members of the work force, the Youth Employment Act is at the top of our list of priority measures. I can't tell you how grateful we are for the support that has come for programs of this kind from you and from others who realize as you do the importance of this situation. If you don't mind one statistic, I'd like to suggest the importance from that standpoint of this Youth Employment Act. In the decade of the 1960's, before we are through, there are going to be 6 million more age 14 to 24 people in the work force than there were in 1960. That isn't so important unless you realize that in the previous decade that number went up only 425,000, which means that we have to find jobs in the next 8 years for 15 times as many youngsters as we did in the previous decade. Now statistics always bother me when you start applying them to people, but the impact of this one alone is enough to suggest that we simply have to meet this youth unemployment problem as a separate problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it would be a tragedy if our Nation, with all of its wealth, and all of its scientific and technological know-how is incapable or unable to meet the job opportunity problem, or the provision of work opportunities for our young people. I noticed the other day a statistic that was shocking—and this is one of the reasons I feel so strongly about the Youth Employment Act—that there are between 800,000 and 1 million young men and women who are unemployed. They are out of school, and they are out of work. It is to that problem that the Youth Employment Act is directed in part—to get these young people out into the forests, out into our national parks and State parks to give them constructive work along the lines of the old Civilian Conserva-

tion Corps program. And there is the second feature that you feel so strongly about, as I do—the public service feature.

Mr. WIRTZ. Yes, the community employment program. We are working out projects for both boys and girls in urban communities. If this act is passed, they will be able to live home and find employment opportunities. That will be in addition to this extremely attractive program to put young men into camps for work on conservation programs.

Let me mention one thing about what you said. You talked about the dropout problem. It is hard for me to realize, but I know it's true that there are fewer kids dropping out of school today, in percentage terms, than used to be the case. It isn't that the dropout problem has become worse. It's that there are fewer job opportunities when they do drop out, because in this automated economy that we're moving into, the number of unskilled jobs is going way down. It used to be true that if a boy or a girl who wanted to work dropped out of school, there was an unskilled job. There won't be now. That's what complicates this problem. That's what makes this legislation so vitally important.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That—along with the Manpower Retraining Act to train people in new skills when they lose old jobs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 1, and H.R. 1890, are now being considered and evaluated by the respective committees in both Houses. I have been advised by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Representative CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the House subcommittee considering H.R. 1890, that they expect their committees to complete their work in the near future. I congratulate both Members of the Senate and the House for their thoughtful and intelligent consideration of this legislation during the recent hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] upon the enthusiasm he has demonstrated for this particular proposed legislation and the diligence which he has demonstrated in the hearings. He has done a masterful job.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two weeks ago I held the third of the hearings which I have held in Chicago on the employment problems of youth. On that occasion, as on all the previous occasions, there was a unanimous vote in favor of the bill which has been sponsored for so many years by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The hearing was a representative one, with about 100 persons from various groups in the city in attendance. The discussion was not only interesting, but also constructive. I have forwarded to the respective committees a transcript of the hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota upon the work which he has done. I only hope that it will eventuate in legislation, and that the Youth Conservation Corps and the civilian group in the various cities and localities will come to fruition. In order that that may happen, some hard hearts must be touched, and public sentiment aroused.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for those comments, and more so for the fine work he has been doing to elicit public com-

ment about the proposed legislation. A large number of organizations have been conducting surveys in their respective areas concerning the proposed legislation and everyone, without exception, has come out in strong support of it. I remind the Senate that I know of no organization of any size or of any national distinction in the United States which has not expressed interest in or support for the Youth Conservation Corps concept as a way of meeting some of the problems of our young people.

I understand we may have difficulty in passing the proposal. But I am an optimist. I believe the people want it. I believe Congress can make an impressive record and a great name for itself by doing something concrete, constructive, and positive for the young people of our country.

We ought at least to be willing to make this beginning.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I, too, was very much disturbed by the employment figures issued by the Department of Labor yesterday, and which we all saw in the press this morning. This is a problem that is with us, a problem which we must face up to as Members of Congress.

However, as I listened to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I could not help recalling his statement on a program which has gained some prestige in this country, the program called Meet the Press. As I recall, it was in January 1962, that the Senator from Minnesota said:

I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year, by December 30, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book, rather than a living fact.

I believe I participated in that program with the Senator from Minnesota. I raised some questions at that time. I am glad that he now agrees with those questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Kentucky has expressed today the thought that I had at that particular moment. He has done so in much more beautiful and decorative words than the Senator from Minnesota was able to use on that program.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky was clear; it was persuasive. He has almost made me say it all over again.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky: I was wrong. One of the things I have found out is that when one is wrong, he might just as well admit it.

I had hoped we would get willing cooperation from our Republican friends during the last Congress, the 87th Congress. I was hopeful that they would help us with youth conservation. I was hopeful that they would help us pass a much larger public works program than was passed. I was hopeful that they would help us enthusiastically with the area redevelopment program. I was hopeful they would help us to pass a better tax bill than was passed. I simply had such a sense of optimism and faith in my country and faith in my Republican friends that I thought they would help us more. But my faith was mis-

placed. I grieve over that, because it is difficult for a man to foresee these emotional shocks in these trying and difficult days.

For example, I had hoped that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would lead the fight to strike down the dangerous beast called unemployment. When the proposed legislation for area redevelopment and unemployment compensation, for public works, for small business and expansion, and many other fine programs, was offered, much of which had to be cut back because of the combination of conservative opposition in the Senate, I was hopeful that our Republican friends would stand with us as the defenders of the Republic, the protectors of the good life, the champions of full employment. I was hopeful that they would help us to overcome these difficulties.

But alas and alack, we received little or no help. Despite that, we did better than our predecessors. That is not much of a standard by which to measure oneself, but we did a little better than those who preceded us.

Mr. MORTON. Many of us Republicans stood by the Democrats. Considered by Republican standards, the Democrats have a workable majority in this body. The fact that the Democrats cannot make their programs succeed is not the fault of the Republicans. If we had as much of a majority as the Democrats have, or even half as much, in my opinion we would make some of the programs work.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, have been wrong. I was even so wrong that I organized Willkie clubs in 1940 and thought we were going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was pretty wrong.

Mr. MORTON. I was wrong in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So was I. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the repayment of the debt to West Virginia has so far consisted of the presentation of an autographed copy of "Profiles in Courage" to the library at St. Albans. I know that some of my coal mine friends there find the situation today worse than it was when the Senator from Minnesota made his heroic, courageous effort in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to add the word "futile," too?

Mr. MORTON. No; I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service. In all fairness and honesty, I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service.

However, because the Senator from Minnesota is so understanding, has such a keen sense of humor, and is one of the great Members of this body, one who can "take it" as well as "dish it out," I could not help reminding him of our joint appearance on "Meet the Press," when he so adamantly said that unemployment would be a page in history by the time the calendar year had ended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that the Senator from Kentucky has been so kind as to remind me of that statement once, I hope he will forget it from here on out. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota has spoken of unrequited hope. I wonder if he remembers the somewhat well known quatrain in poetry, which has become somewhat moth-eaten by now:

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that that is an apt characterization of the two political parties—the party of hope and the party of error?

Mr. MORTON. It is simply a question of which is which. I am the one who needs hope now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that confession. [Laughter.] This is one of the signs of the rebirth of the Republican Party—when Republicans speak with such sincerity of hope. I wish to commend the Senator. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Karriek Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1963:

AMBASSADORS

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward Gilson Curtis to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Miss Catherine Van Lier Ribbink to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rabbi Albert Shulman, national chaplain, the American Legion, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Life is essentially a matter of human relations. Human relations is the art of living together. And living together is a matter of sharing our love, our talents, and our blessings for the betterment of mankind. These are embodied in the general welfare of our country and our people.

Through the wise use of the mind and the heart, our America can be made into the great dream that vests every man with dignity, freedom, and promise.

We are grateful that this body of lawmakers is dedicated to the principle that only freemen living in a free society can live with dignity, freedom, and promise. We are grateful that we have fashioned a nation in which every individual is considered a child of God, and every human being is entitled to share the blessings of our American way of life.

May our America always stand for all that is good, just, and right. May our America always be the symbol of man's eternal struggle to achieve the good life. May our America always stand for a grateful people ever mindful of the many treasures that make up our American way of life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator